DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 057 439	EA 003 817
TITLE	A Comprehensive Look at the Elementary School: The Impact of Federal Funds.
INSTITUTION	Texas Education Agency, Austin.
PUB DATE	Aug 71
NOTE	128p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Status Comparison; *Elementary Schools; Evaluation; *Federal Aid; Federal Programs; Questionnaires; State Surveys; *Statistical Data
IDENTIFIERS	*Texas

ABSTRACT

This document analyzes and evaluates data to compare educational program inputs with program results in Texas. School district superintendents, principals, and classroom teachers completed questionnaires concerning school organizational patterns, size, and services; facility conditions; student background, absences, behavior, and performance; and teacher background. The districts included in this survey were representative of schools in Texas and provided reliable information on the kinds of activities being performed Statewide. The sample also reflected activities in schools across the nation and will be used in presenting data on a national level. (Author)

ED057439

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A COMPREHENSIVE LOOK AT THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL:
THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL FUNDS

Prepared by
Division of Assessment and Evaluation
Texas Education Agency
August 1971

EA 003 817

COMPLIANCE WITH TITLE VI CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Reviews of the local educational agency pertaining to compliance with Title VI, Civil Rights Act of 1964, will be conducted periodically by staff representatives of the Texas Education Agency. These reviews will cover at least the following policies and practices:

1. Enrollment and assignment of students without discrimination on the ground of race, color, or national origin.
2. Assignment of teachers and other staff without discrimination on the ground of race, color, or national origin.
3. Non-discriminatory use of facilities.
4. Public notice given by the local educational agency to participants and other citizens of the non-discriminatory policies and practices in effect by the local agency.

In addition to conducting reviews, Texas Education Agency staff representatives will check complaints of non-compliance made by citizens and will report their findings to the United States Commissioner of Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

PUPIL QUESTIONNAIRE 5

General Information 5

Attendance Data 7

Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten Experience 9

Educational Attainment of Pupils 10

Problems of Pupils 12

Academic Problems 12

Non-academic Problems 13

Highlights of Pupils' Background 13

Classification of Problems 13

Race and Ethnic Classification 15

Language Difficulties in the Home 15

Information on Heads of Households 18

Financial Status 18

Welfare Recipients 20

Employment Status 20

Educational Background of Parents 23

Parental Involvement 25

Participation in Federally Funded Programs 26

Participation in Subject Matter Areas 27

Class Size 29

Number of Teachers 29
Instruction Time 29
Summer Educational Programs 30
Special Programs or Services 33
Health Services 32
Other Pupil Personnel Services 33
Pupil Behavior Information 34
Degree of Change 36
Work Habits 36
Supplemental Information 37
Standardized Test Data 39

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE 43
General Information 43
General Characteristics of the Pupils 45
Welfare Needs of Pupils' Families 45
Racial and Ethnic Background 45
Use of Language 45
Potential Dropouts 48
Reading Ability 49
Teacher Characteristics 50
Educational and Experiential Background of Teachers . . 51
Inservice Training Received by Teachers 53
Personal Feeling About School 54
Instructional Organization 56
Grouping 56

Length of Instruction 57

Teaching Techniques and Approaches 57

Use of Aides. 59

Participation of Pupils in Federally Funded Programs 59

Specific Teaching Assignment 60

Pupil Personnel Services. 60

Availability and Quality of Material and Equipment 62

PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE 65

General Information 65

Instructional Organization 65

Location of Campuses 69

Pupil Population Descriptors 70

Free or Reduced Price Food 73

Pupil Records 73

Program Organization Information 76

School Facilities Information. 77

Pupil Personnel Services 78

Adequacy of School Facilities and Resources 82

Occupational Familiarization Programs 83

Media Services, Equipment, and Materials 84

DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRE. 87

Use of Federal Funds 87

Income Level of Families 88

Extent To Which Special Needs of Target Populations Were met. 88

Use of Standardized Tests 93
Community Advisory Committees 93
Regional Services 94
District Services 95
Inservice Training 97
Services Provided to Students 99
Occupational Familiarization Programs 100
District Media Services 103
Difficulties Encountered by Districts 105

APPENDIX A 107

LIST OF TABLES

Pupil Questionnaire

Table A-1 Classification of Pupils By Enrollment 6

Table A-2 Districution of Pupils By Sex. 6

Table A-3 Classification 14

Table A-4 Percent of Pupils By Racial or National Origin 16

Table A-5 Income Level of Families 19

Table A-6 Occupations of Heads of Households 22

Table A-7 Educational Attainment of Heads of Households 24

Table A-8 Pupil Participation in Special Programs or Services. . 31

Table A-9 Pupil Participation in Health Services 33

Table A-10 Pupil Participation in Pupil Personnel Services . . . 35

Teacher Questionnaire

Table B-1 Classification of Teachers By Grade Level. 44

Table B-2 Percentage of Teachers With Pupil Whose Head of Household Is On Welfare or Chronically Unemployed . 46

Table B-3 Percent of Male Teachers on Title I Eligible and Non-Title I Eligible Campuses. 51

Table B-4 Hours of Inservice Training Received By Teachers . . . 53

Table B-5 Percent of Teachers Who Received Training in Subject Areas. 55

Table B-6 Percent of Teachers With Pupils in Federally Funded Programs. 56

Principal Questionnaire

Table C-1 Percent of Campuses Providing Instruction At Each Grade Level 66

Table C-2 Estimates By Prinicpals of Percent of Sixth Grade Pupils Reading Below Grade Level 72

Table C-3 Percent of Campuses Providing Free or Reduced Price Breakfasts, Lunches, Milk, and Snacks. 74

Table C-4 Percent of Campuses Having Specialized Facilities. . . . 79

INTRODUCTION

Through a joint effort of both the U. S. Office of Education and State education agencies, a coherent system to evaluate education was evolved. The Elementary School Survey is one part of that effort.

The four Elementary School Survey instruments were developed so that inputs to programs could be compared to program results. The instruments were questionnaires for three different respondents: school district superintendents, campus principals, and classroom teachers.

School district superintendents provided the following kinds of information:

Organizational patterns

Personnel training opportunities

Participation in federally aided activities

The campus principal questionnaire included the following kinds of information:

Programs and services provided by schools

Condition of school facilities

Size and location of schools

Nature and size of staff

Classroom teachers, because of their contact with pupils, were asked to complete two questionnaires, one on the classroom environment and the other on four of their pupils randomly selected. The information included in these questionnaires provides the basis for evaluating program effectiveness. It includes:

Teacher Questionnaire

- Classroom facilities
- Classroom organization
- Program of instruction
- Teacher background

Pupil Questionnaire

- Pupil background
- Absences
- Academic program participation
- Behavior
- Performance

The districts included in this Survey were selected on the basis of a sampling procedure outlined by the U. S. Office of Education. The sample was selected to be representative of schools in Texas and to provide reliable information on the kinds of activities being performed statewide. The sample was also representative of what was occurring in schools across the nation and thus will be used in presenting data on a national level.

There were 91 school districts who provided information in the Elementary School Survey. Because of unforeseen problems, however, information was not available at each of the four levels for all 91 districts.

The 91 districts included each of the 7 districts in the state having more than 35,000 in Average Daily Attendance (ADA). The remainder of the Survey consisted of a sample of the districts with 34,999 ADA to 300 ADA. No school districts with less than 300 ADA were included in this Survey. The following table indicated the number of districts in each strata included in the Survey, the number of districts in the state, and the percent of total districts by strata in the state represented in the Survey.

Table 1

ANALYSIS OF DISTRICTS INCLUDED IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SURVEY

Strata		Number of Districts in Sample	Number of Districts in State	Percent of Districts in Each Strata in Sample
I	125,000 and over ADA	2	2	100%
II	35,000 to 124,999 ADA	5	5	100
III	9,000 to 34,999 ADA	17	40	43
IV	3,000 to 8,999 ADA	20	84	24
V	300 to 2,999 ADA	47	601	8
VI	299 and less ADA	--	420	--

The campuses in these districts which were included in the Survey were chosen by the U. S. Office of Education according to their sampling guide. The only constraint in selecting these campuses was that they were to provide instruction to pupils in Grades 2, 4, and/or 6. The principals of each of the campuses selected to participate in the Survey completed the Principal Questionnaire.

All teachers of Grades 2, 4, and 6 on these campuses completed the Teacher Questionnaire and each teacher randomly selected four pupils to be included in the Survey. The teacher then completed a separate Pupil Questionnaire on each of the four pupils.

Presented on the following pages is a report and analysis of the data collected on the four questionnaires. The analyses are presented in this order: Pupil Questionnaire, Teacher Questionnaire, Principal Questionnaire, and District Questionnaire.

It is hoped that the presentation of this data will lead to a better understanding of the purposes of data collection and how evaluative data is being used. Processing of the data for this report was accomplished through the Management Information Center of the Texas Education Agency. Analysis and evaluation of the data was performed by the Division of Assessment and Evaluation of the Texas Education Agency.

PUPIL QUESTIONNAIRE

GENERAL INFORMATION:

The data on the Pupil Questionnaire of the Elementary School Survey included approximately 10,000 pupils in 86 school districts. These districts serve approximately 1,166,585 pupils in average daily attendance in Texas. Approximately 45 percent of these pupils are in Grades 1 through 6. The pupils in this Survey were categorized according to three criteria:

(1) Those pupils who had been on a campus which received no ESEA, Title I funds or pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses.

(2) Those pupils who had been on a campus which received ESEA, Title I funds and the pupils had participated in a reading, mathematics, and/or English language arts program supported by ESEA, Title I funds. These pupils shall hereafter be refferred to as Title I funded program participants.

(3) Those pupils who had been on a campus which received ESEA, Title I funds but had not participated in a reading, mathematics, or English language arts program which was supported by ESEA, Title I funds. These pupils may, however, have received services and/or acitvities provided through ESEA, Title I. These pupils shall hereafter be referred to as Title I eligible non participants.

The data are presented in this manner in order to determine the differences and similarities in pupils, their backgrounds, and activities provided to them in the three types of settings outlined above. These data can help determine what the federal funding patterns were in 1969-70 and help in establishing future federally funded programs.

These categories of pupils will be used consistently through the analysis of the data gathered from the Pupil Questionnaire. The percentage of pupils included in this Survey were classified by enrollment as shown in Table A-1.

Table A-1

CLASSIFICATION OF PUPILS BY ENROLLMENT

Grade Level	Non-Title I Eligible Pupils	Title I Funded Program Participants	Title I Eligible Non-Participants
Grade 2	31.0%	37.0%	35.0%
Grade 4	32.0	33.0	32.0
Grade 6	28.0	25.0	28.0
Ungraded Classes	9.0	5.0	5.0
Ungraded Classes for Handicapped	.5	.6	.8
Graded Classes for Handicapped	---	---	.1

The distribution of these pupils by sex is shown in Table A-2.

Table A-2

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPILS BY SEX

Sex	Non-Title I Eligible Pupils	Title I Funded Program Participants	Title I Eligible Non-Participants
Male	51%	53%	48%
Female	49	47	52

ATTENDANCE DATA:

A higher absenteeism, over 20 days, was recorded for pupils on Title I eligible campuses than for those pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses. The number of days each pupil in the Survey was absent was recorded by the teacher. The percent of pupils with "no absences" from each of the categories was ten percent. This data was approximately the same for each of the three categories. Forty-six percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses, 38 percent of the pupils who were Title I funded program participants, and 41 percent of the pupils who were Title I eligible non-participants were absent one to five days. Approximately 24 percent of the pupils in all three categories had an absentee rate of six to ten days; and 5 percent an absentee rate of 16 to 20 days. Only 5 percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses included in this Survey were absent more than 20 days during that school year.

The primary reason for absenteeism, as indicated by teachers, was due to illness. On non-Title I eligible campuses 93 percent of the pupils were absent due to illness; 87 percent of the Title I funded program participants and Title I eligible non-participants were absent due to illness. The percent of pupils who were absent due to a lack of interest in coming to school was higher on Title I eligible campuses than on non-Title I eligible campuses. On these campuses there were nine percent and seven percent respectively, who were absent due to lack of interest and on non-Title I eligible campuses only four percent of the pupils were absent for this reason.

The lack of parental concern was a major reason for pupils' absence on Title I eligible campuses. Of those pupils who were Title I funded program participants, ten percent were absent because of a lack of parental concern; eight percent of the Title I eligible non-participants were absent for this reason; and only five percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses were absent for this reason. Another major reason for absence on Title I eligible campuses was the need for pupils to remain at home in order to perform other duties (babysitting, farm chores, etc.). Ten percent of the pupils who were Title I funded program participants were absent for this reason; and only two percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses were absent because of the need to remain home to perform other duties.

A greater percent of pupils on Title I eligible campuses than on non-Title I eligible campuses were away from school because of a pupil deficiency which prevented his attendance (e.g., lack of clothing, proper diet, transportation, etc.). Approximately four percent of the pupils on Title I eligible campuses were absent because of some pupil deficiency and only one percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses were absent for this reason. Responses on this question were to be made for all reasons that applied to a pupil and thus the above responses are more than 100 percent. Teachers indicate that pupils on Title I eligible campuses have attended fewer schools than pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses. Approximately 56 percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses had attended only one school since they began first grade and 49 percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses had attended only one school.

Approximately 34 percent of the pupils on Title I eligible campuses had attended two to three schools and approximately 5.5 percent had attended more than four schools. Forty percent of those pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses had attended two to three schools since beginning first grade and approximately 6.5 percent had attended four or more campuses. This information was not available for three percent of all the pupils surveyed.

PRE-KINDERGARTEN AND KINDERGARTEN EXPERIENCES:

A greater percent of pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses had been involved in a kindergarten program prior to entering first grade than pupils on Title I eligible campuses. However, a greater percent of the pupils on Title I eligible campuses had participated in prekindergarten programs than had pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses. The prekindergarten programs included programs such as nursery school, Head Start, day care centers, etc.

Forty-one percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses had participated in kindergarten programs while approximately 32 percent of the pupils in the other two categories who had attended Title I eligible campuses participated in kindergarten programs. Approximately 20 percent of the pupils on Title I eligible campuses and only 10 percent on non-Title I eligible campuses had participated in prekindergarten programs. Twenty percent of the teachers in each of the three categories did not respond to this question. This is considered to be a high percent of "no responses." Another 20 percent of the teachers indicated they did not know what kinds of programs, if any, pupils had participated in prior to entering first grade.

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF PUPILS:

Teachers were asked to judge the expected educational attainment of pupils based on the pupils' present attitudes by marking only one response for each pupil. If a teacher predicted that a pupil would graduate from high school, it was assumed that pupil would complete the eighth grade and begin high school. The following percentages, therefore, are unduplicated.

On non-Title I eligible campuses, teachers predicted on the basis of pupils' present attitudes that 50 percent of the pupils surveyed would enter college. Teachers predicted that 31 percent of the Title I eligible non-participants and 23 percent of the Title I funded program participants would enter college. Six percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses; five percent of the Title I eligible non-participants and four percent of the Title I funded program participants would receive post high school education other than college. Thirty percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses, 39 percent of the Title I eligible non-participants, and 39 percent of the Title I funded program participants were predicted to only graduate from high school. Ten percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses, 11 percent of the Title I eligible non-participants, and 17 percent of the Title I funded program participants were predicted to start but not finish high school. Only 3 percent of the pupils on non-

Title I eligible campuses were expected to attain no more than the eighth grade or less while 9 percent of the pupils who were Title I eligible non-participants and 12 percent who were Title I funded program participants were expected to attain only the eighth grade or less.

Teachers were asked to make the same judgment about their pupils based on the pupils' educational abilities. Again only one response was made for each pupil and the following percentages are unduplicated. Considering pupils' educational abilities, teachers expected 60 percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses to enter college. Teachers of Title I eligible non-participants expected 42 percent of the pupils surveyed to enter college while teachers of Title I funded program participants expected only 32 percent of the pupils surveyed to enter college. Eight percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses, eight percent of the Title I eligible non-participants, and six percent of the Title I funded program participants were predicted to receive post high school education other than college.

Twenty-one percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses, 29 percent of the Title I eligible non-participants, and 34 percent of the Title I funded program participants were predicted only to graduate from high school. Seven percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses, 11 percent of the Title I eligible non-participants, and 17 percent of the Title I funded program participants were predicted to start but not finish high school. Only three percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses were predicted to reach the eighth grade or less. However, 8 percent of the Title I eligible non-participants and 11 percent of the Title I funded program participants were predicted to reach only the eighth grade or less based on the pupils' scholastic potential.

From this information it appears that the teacher perceives those pupils who are participating in Title I funded mathematics, reading, and/or English language arts programs as having the lowest scholastic potential or educational ability.

PROBLEMS OF PUPILS:

Teachers indicated that almost half of the pupils in this Survey had no persistent problems. Fifty-two percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses had no persistent problems. Also, 31 percent of the Title I funded program participants and 44 percent of the Title I eligible non-participants were judged to have no persistent problems.

Academic Problems

Low achievement in mathematics was recorded for 19 percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses, 35 percent of the pupils who were Title I funded program participants, and 26 percent of the pupils who were Title I eligible non-participants. Low achievement in reading was recorded for 25 percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses, 47 percent of the pupils who were Title I funded program participants, and 32 percent of the pupils who were Title I eligible non-participants. Low achievement in English language arts was recorded for 18 percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses, 36 percent of the pupils who were Title I funded program participants, and 26 percent of the pupils who were Title I eligible non-participants.

This data again implies that those pupils most in need of special treatment in mathematics, reading, and English language arts are receiving that treatment. If these teachers' diagnoses and techniques for treatment are correct, future statistics should show positive change.

Non-academic Problems

There appeared to be no significant difference in the percent of pupils in each of the three categories with problems of poor hearing, physical handicaps (other than those noted), chronic disease, social immaturity, emotional problems, and anti-social behavior. However, there were a greater percent of pupils on the Title I eligible campuses than there were pupils on the non-Title I eligible campuses who had poor vision, speech defects, other psychomotor deficiencies, mental retardation, malnutrition, and family instability. This is evidence of the type of problems that exist among pupils from low-income and socio-economically disadvantaged homes.

HIGHLIGHTS OF PUPILS' BACKGROUND:

Classification of Problems

Almost half of the pupils in this Survey were considered not to have problems which were common to groups identified on Table A-3.

The percent of pupils who could be identified as having problems common to any of the following groups for the three pupil categories are indicated in Table A-3.

Table A-3

CLASSIFICATION OF PROBLEMS

Group Classification	Non-Title I Eligible Pupils	Title I Funded Program Participants	Title I Eligible Non-Participants
Academically Disadvantaged	10.0%	31.0%	19.0%
Socio-economically Disadvantaged	7.0	38.0	26.0
Academically Gifted	14.0	4.0	7.0
Pupils from homes where the dominant language is not English	8.0	32.0	27.0
Potential Dropout	7.0	19.0	13.0
Emotionally or Mentally Handicapped	5.0	8.0	6.0
Migrant	.5	4.0	2.0
Neglected or Delinquent	1.0	5.0	3.0
Physically Handicapped	1.0	1.0	.7

Approximately 65 percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses were not classified as any of the above because none of the classifications were applicable to them. Teachers indicated that 28 percent of the Title I eligible participants and 41 percent of the Title I eligible non-participants could not be classified in any of the above groups. It would seem inappropriate that they participate in Title I funded programs if they are neither economically nor academically disadvantaged.

Race and Ethnic Classification

The classification of the pupils in the three categories by racial or national origin is shown in Table A-4 in columns 1 through 3. The percent of all the pupils in the Survey by racial or national origin is shown in column 4. Column 5 provides the percent of all pupils in the state by racial or national origin. Column 5 figures were collected from the Fall 1970, Elementary and Secondary School Civil Rights Survey.

The figures on the Elementary School Survey were comparable to the percentages of racial or national origin groups statewide. It appears that the Elementary School Survey includes approximately nine percent more Spanish-surnamed pupils and approximately ten percent less Anglos than were on the Elementary and Secondary School Civil Rights Survey. However, there was no precise standard for reporting this type data on either survey.

LANGUAGE DIFFICULTIES IN THE HOME:

Homes where the dominant language was not English accounted for 38 percent of the pupils who were Title I funded program participants and 34 percent of the pupils who were Title I eligible non-participants. Only 12 percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses were from such a home. In all three categories, almost all of these pupils were from a home where Spanish was spoken instead of English. Of those pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses who were from homes where the dominant language was one other than

Table A-4

PERCENT OF PUPILS BY RACIAL OR NATIONAL ORIGIN

Racial or National Origin	Non-Title I Eligible Pupils	Title I Funded Program	Eligible Title I Non-Participants	All Pupils in Elementary School Survey	Elementary and Secondary School Civil Rights Survey, Fall 1970
Negro	5.0%	29.0%	24.0%	17.0%	15.2%
Spanish-surnamed	15.0	41.0	39.0	30.0	21.3
American Indian	.2	.1	.1	.2	.1
Oriental	.2	.1	.3	.2	.2
Anglo	78.0	28.0	34.0	52.0	63.2

English, 37 percent of the heads of households had the ability to speak "good" fluent English, 33 percent "fair"; 12 percent "poor", and 5 percent "could not use English".

The ability of the heads of households of pupils who were on Title I eligible campuses to speak fluent English was approximately the same for both categories of pupils on these campuses. Approximately 25 percent of the heads of these pupils' households spoke "good" English; 35 percent "fair" English; and seven percent "could not use English". However, there were more Title I funded program participants than the other two pupil categories who came from a family where the head of the household spoke "poor" English. Sixteen percent of the pupils on Title I eligible campuses were not participating in those Title I funded academic programs even though they came from homes where the head of the household spoke "poor" English.

Teachers indicated that 33 percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses and 53 percent on Title I eligible campuses, who were from homes where the dominant language was one other than English, would not normally speak English when playing with their closest friends.

The ability of pupils from homes in which the dominant language was one other than English to speak understandable English was also judged by the teachers. The pupils on Title I eligible campuses, in both categories, had approximately the same ability to speak English. Approximately 55 percent spoke "good" English; 36 percent spoke "fair" English; and 8 percent spoke "poor" English.

Of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses, 61 percent could speak "good" English; 34 percent "fair" English; and 3 percent "poor" English.

INFORMATION ON HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS:

Mothers and grandparents were heads of the household for approximately 32 percent of the pupils from Title I eligible campuses. The father, if present in the household, is usually considered the head of that household. For pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses, the father was the head of 86 percent of the pupils' households. Sixty-eight percent of the pupils who were Title I funded program participants and 74 percent who were Title I eligible non-participants were from homes in which the father was the head of the household.

Financial Status

Information about the pupils' family financial status was difficult for teachers to gather. Estimates were used in 89 percent of the responses given for pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses and approximately 75 percent of the responses on pupils from Title I eligible campuses. School records and other records provided more data for pupils on Title I eligible campuses than on non-Title I eligible campuses. Data were furnished from these sources for approximately 17 percent of the pupils on Title I eligible campuses. These data were available because it is a necessity that reliable data be provided in order to place pupils into Title I funded programs or to provide pupils with special services.

Teachers were asked to give an estimate of the minimum and maximun income level of a pupil's family. These two figures were averaged and this is the basis upon which the following information is given. The table below includes the percent of pupils from families at each income level.

Table A-5

INCOME LEVEL OF FAMILIES

Income Level	Pupils on Non-Title I Eligible Campuses	Title I Funded Program Participants	Title I Eligible Non-Participants
Less than $2,000	.7%	4.0%	3.0%
$2,000	1.0	9.0	6.0
$3,000	2.0	16.0	11.0
$4,000-$6,000	21.0	43.0	51.0
$7,000-$9,000	35.0	14.0	21.0
$10,000-$12,000	19.0	3.0	5.0
$14,000-$18,000	13.0	2.0	2.0
$20,000 and over	4.0	.2	.5

The percent of pupils for which there were no responses was four percent for pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses, nine percent for pupils who were Title I funded program participants, and only one percent for pupils who were Title I eligible non-participants.

Welfare Recipients

Information requested about families of pupils who received welfare payments indicates that the greatest percent of the families included pupils who were Title I funded program participants. Fourteen percent of the pupils' families in this category received welfare payments and teachers indicated they did not know if another 17 percent of these pupils parents received these payments. Some correlations seem apparent between this data and the percent of pupils from unstable families, from socio-economically disadvantaged homes, from homes where the dominant language was not English, and the occupation of the head of the household. In each of these areas, the category of pupils with the highest percentages were those who had been Title I funded program participants. These pupils were also lowest in academic achievement. The exact relationship among these factors has not been substantiated.

The percent of pupils who were Title I eligible non-participants and were from families receiving welfare payments was eight percent. Teachers had no knowledge about another 15 percent of the pupils' families receiving welfare payments. Only two percent of the pupils who were on non-Title I eligible campuses were from families who received welfare payments. In giving an estimate of the average annual income, teachers included welfare payments if they had this data available.

Employment Status

Approximately two-thirds of the parents of participants in Title I funded programs are employed in semi-skilled or better occupations. Teachers were unable to respond about the employment status of the heads of the pupils' households for approximately eight percent of all the pupils surveyed. They indicated that 89 percent of the heads of households of pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses were regularly employed, 1 percent were seasonally employed, and only 1 percent were chronically unemployed. Note should be made that two percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses were from families who received welfare payments.

Seventy-one percent of the heads of households of pupils who were Title I funded program participants were regularly employed, eight percent were seasonally employed, and nine percent were chronically unemployed. The percent of those seasonally employed and chronically unemployed is comparable to the percent of families of pupils in this category receiving welfare payments. Seventy-six percent of the heads of households of pupils who were Title I eligible non-participants were regularly employed, five percent were seasonally employed, and five percent were chronically unemployed. Again, note the comparison between those pupils from families in which the heads of households are seasonally employed and chronically unemployed and the percent of pupils' families in this category receiving welfare payments.

The occupation of the primary supporter of the pupil's family was requested. Approximately nine percent of the teachers did not respond to this question and another ten percent said they did not know. Those who were able to indicate the occupation of the primary supporter of the pupil's family responded as shown in Table A-6.

Table A-6

OCCUPATIONS OF HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS

Occupation	Non-Title I Eligible Pupils	Title I Funded Program Participants	Title I Eligible Non-Participants
Farm workers	.5%	4.0%	2.0%
Farm managers or owners	.4	2.0	1.0
Unskilled workers, laborers, or domestic workers	8.0	28.0	26.0
Semi-skilled worker	18.0	23.0	25.0
Skilled worker	2.0	13.0	19.0
Sales agents and representatives	9.0	2.0	3.0
Technician	6.0	.2	2.0
Managers or Foremen	11.0	3.0	5.0
Officials	4.0	.2	1.0
Professionals	15.0	3.0	4.0

Teachers indicated that approximately 29 percent of the mothers in all three categories were employed in full-time steady work. Nine percent of the mothers of pupils who were on non-Title I eligible campuses held part-time or seasonal work; 14 percent of the mothers of pupils who were Title I funded program participants held this kind of work; and 11 percent of the mothers of pupils who were Title I eligible non-participants were seasonally or part-time employed.

The total number of persons living in the pupil's home, including the pupil, was provided by the teacher. Approximately three-fourths of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses were from homes in which there were four to six people. Fifty percent of the pupils who were Title I funded program participants were in homes of six to ten people and seven percent of these pupils were in homes of eleven or more persons. Forty-seven percent of the Title I eligible non-participants were in homes of six to ten persons and only four percent were in homes of eleven or more persons.

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF PARENTS:

Almost half of the heads of households of Title I funded program participants were high school graduates. Only 20 percent of the heads of households of pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses had not completed high school compared to 51 percent of the heads of pupils' households who were Title I funded program participants and 46 percent of the heads of pupils' households who were Title I eligible non-participants. Table A-7 indicates the highest educational attainment of parents of the three pupil groups.

Table A-7

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS

Educational Level	Non-Title I Eligible Pupils	Title I Funded Program Participants	Title I Eligible Non-Participants
Little or no education	3.0%	15.0%	11.0%
Probably completed grade school	6.0	17.0	17.0
Probably some high school	11.0	19.0	18.0
Probably completed high school	23.0	16.0	21.0
Probably some post high school training but not college	11.0	4.0	6.0
Probably some college	15.0	4.0	5.0
Probably completed college	16.0	3.0	4.0
Probably some graduate school education	7.0	.5	2.0

Approximately 65 percent of the mothers of pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses had completed high school and 34 percent of these had continued their education in college or received other post high school training. Fifty-six percent of the mothers of pupils who were Title I funded program participants had not completed high school and 15 percent of these had little or no education. Only 26 percent of these mothers had received any kind of post high school education. Forty-six percent of the mothers of Title I eligible non-participants had not completed high school and of these, 11 percent had little or no education. The rate of "no responses" was high on this question, ranging from 14 percent to 20 percent.

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT:

Approximately 59 percent of the parents or guardians of pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses and 52 percent of the parents or guardians of Title I funded program participants had met with an official or representative of the school during the 1969-70 school year in which this Survey was made. However, only 47 percent of the parents or guardians of pupils who were Title I eligible non-participants had met with representatives of the school.

Parents of pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses responded best to requests by the teacher to attend a meeting between teacher and parents or guardians. Only 5 percent of the parents or guardians of these pupils had not responded to a request for a meeting whereas 11 percent of the parents or guardians of Title I funded program participants and 9 percent of the parents or guardians of Title I eligible non-participants had refused such requests.

PARTICIPATION IN FEDERALLY FUNDED PROGRAMS:

Reading programs enroll 88 percent of the Title I funded program participants. Outlined in the introduction to the data collected from this Questionnaire was an explanation of how the analysis of these data was made based on pupils' participation in federally funded programs.

Of those pupils who were Title I funded program participants, 46 percent were involved in a Title I mathematics program, 88 percent in a Title I reading program, 54 percent in a Title I English language arts program, 38 percent in a Title I science program, and 4 percent in a Title I occupational familiarization program. Approximately half of these pupils were in an "other" academic program.

Sixty-four percent of these pupils were placed into these special programs on the basis of teacher recommendation, 46 percent on pupil grades, 47 percent on "other" methods, 26 percent on standardized test scores, and 11 percent on the basis of special needs (e.g., physical handicaps). However, 41 percent of the pupils who received special treatment in academic programs were placed into the programs according to no predetermined basis. Only an approximate five percent of these pupils were involved in any academic programs supported by other federal funds.

Those pupils who were Title I eligible participants were not involved in a mathematics, reading, or English language arts program supported by ESEA, Title I. However, approximately two percent of these pupils were in mathematics, reading, or English language arts programs supported by ESEA, Title III, VII, or VIII. Only .5 percent of these pupils were in an occupational familiarization program supported by ESEA, Title I and there were no pupils in this kind of program supported by other federal funds.

A small percent, approximately four percent, of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses were involved in programs which were supported by ESEA, Title III. Teachers indicated that there were also approximately two percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses who participated in ESEA, Title I academic programs. However, the responses must either be considered inaccurate responses by the teacher because none of these pupils were on campuses eligible to receive ESEA, Title I funds or the pupils were actually being served by ESEA, Title I funds when they were on ineligible campuses, perhaps pointing out an error in the distribution of these funds.

PARTICIPATION IN SUBJECT MATTER AREAS:

The self-contained classroom still serves most of the elementary pupils surveyed. Teachers were asked to respond to the question, "Does this pupil receive all of his instruction in mathematics, reading, and English language arts from you?" Sixty-one percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses, 51 percent of the Title I funded program participants, and 65 percent of the Title I eligible non-participants received all their instruction from one teacher. This indicates that those pupils involved in Title I reading, mathematics, and/or English language arts programs were provided more special treatment through the use of more than one teacher.

Further information was requested about pupils in reading, mathematics, and English language arts. These data were based on all participants in a subject matter area, whether the funding source for that program was federal, state, or local. In some instances questions have arisen about the data, because of the manner in which totals appeared. Some of these incongruencies were due to a duplication of a pupil's activities as reported by the teacher when it was specifically requested that only one response be given. Another problem was the complete failure of a teacher to respond to a particular question and a misunderstanding on the part of the teacher completing the questionnaire regarding the information which was being requested.

Teachers were asked if pupils took each of the three subjects. Five percent of the pupils on non-Title I, eligible campuses were not involved in each of the three subjects. Of the pupils who were Title I funded program participants, eight percent did not take mathematics, ten percent did not take reading, and eight percent did not take English language arts. Of the pupils who were Title I eligible non-participants, eight percent did not take mathematics and reading, and seven percent did not take English language arts.

Class Size

The average size of pupils' instructional groups was from 26 to 35 pupils. Reading classes appear to be the smallest instructional groups, especially on Title I eligible campuses. Thirty-eight percent of the pupils in Title I funded reading programs were in classes of two to ten pupils, 16 percent in classes of 11 to 15 pupils, six percent in classes of 16 to 20 pupils, and 10 percent in classes of 21 to 25 pupils. The other pupils on Title I eligible campuses, although not involved in Title I reading programs, appeared to be in smaller instructional groups than pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses.

Number of Teachers

In all three subject areas there was usually only one teacher instructing the group. Two or more instructional personnel were used most often in reading. Two or more teachers instructed the reading classes in which 21 percent of the Title I funded program participants were enrolled. Eleven percent of the mathematics classes in which these Title I funded program participants were involved, were also taught by two or more teachers.

Instruction Time

The average number of minutes per period devoted to mathematics and reading instructional groups was 40 to 60 minutes. The greatest percent of pupils were in English language arts classes that were 15 to 40 minutes in duration. There appeared to be no significant difference in the length of instructional periods between the three categories of pupils. Approximately

20 percent of the pupils were in reading classes that were more than 75 minutes in duration and only 5 percent or fewer pupils were were in any instructional groups of 15 minutes or less.

The number of instructional periods per week for each class and the number of weeks per year each pupil was in the class were also indicated by teachers. These data are difficult to analyze, however, in that they should be linked to the number of minutes per period a pupil was in that class. This would need to be done for each individual pupil in order to do proper justice to the available data. It is impossible to determine which pupils are receiving the greatest number of instructional periods per week. It would be interesting to examine the length of the periods and the number of weeks over which their treatment is extended. It can be noted that almost all pupils in the three pupil categories and all three subject matter areas receive treatment four or five times a week for at least 30 weeks or the entire school year. Approximately 17 percent of the pupils in reading classes and 10 percent of the pupils in English language arts classes received treatment six or more times a week.

SUMMER EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS:

Data on summer educational programs were included in the Survey although only approximately eight percent of the pupils participated in these programs. Four percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses, 16 percent of the Title I funded program participants, and 8 percent of the Title I eligible non-participants participated.

The majority of the instructional groups were reading classes in which pupils participated four to six times a week during a six weeks period. Only a very small percent of pupils participated in other academic classes. Cultural enrichment programs were a predominant part of the summer educational programs.

SPECIAL PROGRAMS OR SERVICES:

A wide variety of special programs were made available to students by many school districts. A pupil could participate in more than one activity. The percentage of pupils participating in these activities is shown in Table A-8.

Table A-8

PUPIL PARTICIPATION IN SPECIAL PROGRAMS OR SERVICES

Special Programs	Non-Title I Eligible Pupils	Title I Funded Program Participants	Title I Eligible Non-Participants
Social experiences in the community	20.0%	18.0%	20.0%
Nature programs	9.0	9.0	13.0
Fine arts programs	23.0	18.0	29.0
Advanced placement programs	.6	.3	1.0
Independent study	10.0	7.0	10.0
Other special programs	16.0	17.0	30.0

The reader should note that the percent of pupils in all three pupil categories involved in social experiences in the community is approximately the same. This perhaps shows that Title I eligible campus personnel have an increasing awareness of the need of their pupils in this area and are trying to provide these social experiences to the pupils on their campuses. The greater percent of pupils who were eligible non-participants involved in fine arts programs also indicates the growing awareness of school personnel for providing these types of programs to educationally and socio-economically disadvantaged pupils. These particular pupils were judged to have no need of special treatment in mathematics, reading, or English language arts. The percentages presented above indicate that school personnel felt that these pupils had other areas of need for which the school could provide treatment.

Pupils on Title I eligible campuses spent a greater number of hours during the school year in these special programs than did the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses. Approximately 28 percent of these pupils spent over 50 hours during the entire school year in special programs.

HEALTH SERVICES:

Over 90 percent of Title I funded program participants received school health services. Teachers could indicate that a pupil had received more than one school health service. However, the rate of "no responses" appears to be over 30 percent for pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses and for pupils who were Title I eligible participants. Pupils, in each of the three categories, receiving school health services are shown in Table A-9.

Table A-9

PUPIL PARTICIPATION IN HEALTH SERVICES

Health Services	Non-Title I Eligible Pupils	Title I Funded Program Participants	Title I Eligible Non-Participants
Physical, dental, and/or eye examination	41.0%	50.0%	36.0%
Medical and/or dental treatment or therapy	2.0	13.0	4.0
Other health service	19.0	31.0	18.0

On Title I eligible campuses, these services may or may not have been provided through the use of Title I funds.

OTHER PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES:

Other pupil personnel services were also provided to pupils. These included activities such as pupil appraisals, counseling, and home visitations. The teachers were instructed to include only those services which were provided by local school district personnel, such as the school attendance officer, counselor, health officials, psychologist, or social worker. More than one response could have been made for each pupil. The percent of pupils who received each of the services and the percent who needed the service and did not receive it is shown in Table A-10 for the three categories of pupils.

The greatest percent of pupils receiving these kinds of activities were pupils who were Title I funded program participants. This is the category of pupils which had the greatest percent of pupils from unstable family situations, pupils with emotional problems, and pupils from families in which the heads of the household were unemployed. This points out that more of the pupils with the greatest needs are being served by activities which provide help for their problems.

The percent of pupils needing services but not receiving them was approximately the same for all three categories of pupils.

PUPIL BEHAVIOR INFORMATION:

Teachers were asked to rate pupils on a number of items regarding the pupil's behavior, taking into consideration how the pupil performed when the teacher first came into direct contact with him and how he performed at the end of the school year. A wide range of pupil behaviors were listed, including care in handling school property, creativity, responsibility in completing class assignments, self concept, dress habits, anxiety, attendance, subject matter proficiency, educational aspirations, interest in subject matter, and numerous other behavior factors.

Table A-10

PUPIL PARTICIPATION IN PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES

Pupil Personnel Services	Pupil Received Service			Pupil Needed Service But Did Not Receive Service		
	Non-Title I Eligible Pupils	Title I Funded Program Participants	Title I Eligible Non-Participants	Non-Title I Eligible Pupils	Title I Funded Program Participants	Title I Eligible Non-Participants
Diagnostic Assessment of academic, social, or emotional problems	20.0%	23.0%	17.0%	6.0%	7.0%	7.0%
Case conferences with teachers and other school personnel	13.0	22.0	14.0	4.0	7.0	7.0
Individual counseling	14.0	24.0	14.0	5.0	7.0	7.0
Group counseling	9,0	14.0	11.0	2.0	4.0	3.0
Psychological treatment	.8	3.0	1.0	2.0	4.0	3.0
Home visitation	5.0	20.0	11.0	3.0	5.0	5.0
Remedial programs carried out cooperatively with teachers	7.0	28.0	8.0	5.0	9.0	8.0
Referrals to specialists or agencies outside the school	3.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	5.0
Other	2.0	4.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	2.0

Degree of Change

Teachers generally indicated for all behaviors that pupils had "some change for the better" or that there was "no change because change was not necessary". A significant number of pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses, had a "large change for the better," in the areas of responsibility in completing class assignments, independent learning, and interest in mathematics and reading. A significant number of pupils who were Title I funded program participants had a "large change for the better" in interest in reading, reading proficiency, and responsibility in completing class assignments. A significant number of pupils who were Title I eligible non-participants had a "large change for the better" in reading proficiency, mathematics proficiency, liking for the teacher, and interest in reading and mathematics. The area in which it appeared there was "some change for worse" was in the amount of disruptive behavior. This was the case for all three categories of pupils. Pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses also showed "some change for worse" in attentiveness in class which could be closely linked to disruptive behavior.

Work Habits

Teachers rated the pupils' attitudes in completing a given task. Sixty-three percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses complete the task that was assigned; 18 percent persist for some time, but do not complete the task; 13 percent start the problem, but give up rapidly; and 4 percent give up without trying.

Only 47 percent of the pupils who were Title I funded program participants completed the task that was assigned; 26 percent persisted for some time, but did not complete the task; 18 percent started the problem, but gave up rapidly; and eight percent gave up without trying. These were the pupils who showed the lowest level of achievement in the academic areas.

Fifty-eight percent of the Title I eligible non-participants completed the task that was assigned; 20 percent persisted for some time before giving up; 14 percent started the problem but gave up rapidly; and 6 percent gave up without trying.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

Supplemental information was requested, with the teacher's response based on previous knowledge or informal questioning of the pupil. Two questions concerned the attitudes of parents about the academic achievement and behavior of their child in school. There were no revealing differences between the attitudes of parents of pupils in the three categories.

Seventy-four percent of the parents of pupils would be happier to hear their child was doing very well in his school work than to know he was behaving very well during school. Fifty-nine percent of these same parents would be more unhappy to hear their child was doing very badly in his school work than to hear his child was acting very badly during school.

A question concerning conversations between parents and children about college indicated that teachers felt 41 percent of the parents of pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses had discussed college with their child. Sixteen percent of the teachers felt there had been no such conversations with these pupils and their parents, and 41 percent of the teachers said they had no knowledge about conversations between parents and pupils.

Teachers believed that 22 percent of the pupils who were Title I funded program participants and 28 percent who were Title I eligible non-participants had discussed with their parents the possibility of attending college. Teachers had no knowledge about conversations concerning college between parents and pupils for approximately 45 percent of the pupils.

Outside the school reading habits of pupils were surveyed. Approximately 75 percent of the pupils in all three categories read comic books. Fifty-eight percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses read religious materials, whereas only 50 percent on Title I eligible campuses read these materials. Sixty-six percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses read newspapers and magazines compared to 54 percent on Title I eligible campuses. Eighty-six percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses, 74 percent of the pupils who were Title I funded program participants, and 78 percent who were Title I eligible non-participants read books.

While the data presented in this section is based on a sampling of pupils in a given class, three-fourths of the responding teachers indicated that these pupils were typical in academic performance of most pupils whom they taught.

STANDARDIZED TEST DATA:

Standardized test data were collected in one section of the Pupil Questionnaire of the Elementary School Survey. Test scores were reported by grade equivalent and percentile scores in reading, math, and English language arts for each pupil for whom a questionnaire was completed.

Data for the complete Pupil Questionnaire were available for approximately 10,329 pupils. However, test data were used from only 1,060 of these pupils. The number of pupils from which it was possible to use test information was small in comparison to the total number of pupils surveyed, for the following reasons:

(1) Not all pupils were administered standardized tests.

(2) The test scores were unavailable for reporting on this Survey, If both a pre- and a post-test score was not reported, none of the test data for that pupil could be analyzed.

(3) If the teacher failed to indicate which kind of test was administered on both the pre- and post-tests, the scores reported could not be used.

(4) In order to analyze the data, all pupils who had been tested with the same pre- and post-tests were grouped together. Teachers could have indicated 1 of 21 different tests administered for both the pre- and post-tests. There was a possibility that 51 different combinations of tests could have been used. It would have been impossible to use each of these combinations of pre- and post-tests because the number in each group would have been extremely small, making any kind of analysis

impossible. Thus 12 different combinations of pre- and post-tests which were administered were selected for close analysis. Pupils who were tested with different tests could not be analyzed together because of the differences in standardized tests.

Because of the small number of pupils used in the analysis of test data, all of the 74 districts from which other pupil data were gathered were not represented. Usable test data were available from approximately 50 districts. However, from some of these districts there was information which could be used for only a very small number of pupils. The number of pupils from any one district from which test data could be used ranged from 1 to 203. Thus, it is obvious that the districts which had more usable test data reported on pupils have biased the analysis.

The analysis of standardized test data does not presume to answer any general questions about the achievement that pupils have made or not made in the programs offered to them in the public schools. It is impossible to make any statements about what happened to pupils statewide from the data available. These data only point out and serve as an indicator of what is happening in some school districts. It should point out the areas in which further study should be done in order to refute or substantiate the kinds of problems noted. This analysis is presented in Appendix A.

The basic problem underlying the test data collected in this Survey is the absence of any statewide testing program. Some kind of planned, statewide testing program would assure that there would be information available to make reliable and valid decisions and that this would be comparable information. Presently, it is extremely difficult to make any determination of pupils' achievement because all pupils are not tested with the same instruments.

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

GENERAL INFORMATION:

The information from the Teacher Questionnaire of the 1970 Elementary School Survey was divided into three categories:

(1) Teachers on ESEA, Title I eligible campuses who provided instruction in federally funded mathematics, reading, or English language arts programs

(2) Teachers on ESEA, Title I eligible campuses who did not provide instruction in federally funded mathematics, reading, or English language arts programs

(3) Teachers on campuses not eligible for ESEA, Title I funds.

Since only five percent of the pupils on Title I eligible campuses who participated in federally funded academic programs were in programs funded by federal sources other than ESEA, Title I, it is assumed that most of the teachers on Title I eligible campuses who provided instruction in federally funded programs provided instruction in ESEA, Title I programs.

A total of 2,536 teachers of Grades 2, 4, and 6 from 89 school districts in Texas responded to the questionnaire. The percent of teachers who taught Grades 2, 4, 6, ungraded classes, or ungraded classes for the handicapped in the three types of campuses are listed in Table B-1.

Most of the teaching positions in all three groups were held by only one person during the year; that is, no substitute or replacement teachers held a particular position for more than two consecutive weeks.

Table B-1

CLASSIFICATION OF TEACHERS BY GRADE LEVEL

Grade Level	Percentage of teachers on Title I eligible campuses who provided instruction in federally funded programs	Percentage of teachers on Title I eligible campuses who did not provide instruction in federally funded programs	Percentage of teachers on non-Title I eligible campuses
Grade 2	36%	33%	30%
Grade 4	32	32	31
Grade 4	24	29	27
Ungraded	8	4	11
Ungraded handicapped	0	1	1

The number of students enrolled in the classes of the teachers on non-Title I eligible campuses increased from October 1, 1969 to April 1, 1970, while the number decreased in the classes of both types of teachers on Title I eligible campuses.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PUPILS:

Welfare Need of Pupils Families

Teachers were asked what percentage of their pupils came from families in which the head of the household was receiving welfare or was chronically unemployed. These percentages are shown in Table B-2.

Racial and Ethnic Background

Most of the teachers in all three categories indicated that they had very few, if any, students of the American Indian or Oriental origin.

According to the responses to the question requesting information on the percent of pupils in a class according to racial or national origin, 88 percent of the teachers responding from non-Title I eligible campuses reported 10 percent or fewer Negro pupils in their classes and 72 percent reported 10 percent or fewer Spanish-surnamed Americans. In classes of both types of teachers on Title I eligible campuses there appeared to be a great percentage of Negro and Spanish-surnamed American students in their classes.

Use of Language

The percent of teachers on Title I eligible campuses who provided instruction in federally funded programs and teachers on Title

Table B-2

PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS WITH PUPILS WHOSE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD IS ON WELFARE OR CHRONICALLY UNEMPLOYED

Percentage of pupils from families in which head of household is on welfare or chronically unemployed	Percentage of teachers on Title I eligible campuses who provided instruction in federally funded programs	Percentage of teachers on Title I eligible campuses who did not provide instruction in federally funded programs	Percentage of teachers on non-Title I eligible campuses
None	13.0	18.0	64.0
1-10%	47.0	50.0	30.0
11-25%	18.0	16.0	3.0
26-50%	13.0	8.0	1.0
51-75%	.4	3.0	.2
76-90%	1.0	1.0	.0
91-100%	.6	.3	.1

I eligible campuses who did not provide instruction in federally funded programs were almost the same for the remainder of the responses to questions concerning pupil or teacher characteristics. Therefore, discussion of these sections will concern only two groups of teachers, those teachers on Title I eligible campuses and those teachers on non-Title I eligible campuses.

Only 1.5 percent of the teachers on non-Title I eligible campuses use a language other than English as a medium of instruction except when teaching a foreign language. Ninety-four percent of that 1.5 percent using another language used Spanish. The other six percent used French.

Fifty-three percent of the teachers on non-Title I eligible campuses indicated that none of their pupils came from homes where the dominant language was not English, 28 percent said 1 to 10 percent of these students were from homes where the dominant language was not English. Ten percent said 11 to 50 percent of their pupils were from these types of homes and 7 percent reported that over 50 percent of their students came from homes where the dominant language was not English.

Ten percent of the teachers on Title I eligible campuses who provided instruction in federally funded programs used a language other than English as a medium of instruction. Ninety-eight percent of the teachers on Title I eligible campuses who did not provide instruction in federally funded programs used a language other than English as a medium for instruction. Ninety-nine percent of these teachers used Spanish, while only one percent used French.

Thirty-one percent of the teachers on Title I eligible campuses reported that none of their pupils came from homes where the dominant language was not English, 20 percent said 1 to 10 percent of their class came from homes in which this was the case, 16 percent indicated that 11 to 50 percent of the pupils were from these homes, and 33 percent said over 50 percent of their pupils were from homes in which English was not the dominant language.

There appears to be a correlation between Spanish-surnamed pupils and pupils from homes where the dominant language was not English on both Title I eligible and non-Title I eligible campuses. On non-Title I eligible campuses, 72 percent of the teachers reported fewer than 10 percent of their students were Spanish-surnamed, indicating that the parents are from a community where most likely Spanish was not spoken as the dominant language. However, on the Title I eligible campus a great percent of Spanish-surnamed students were present, corresponding to the percent of students from homes where the dominant language was not English.

Potential Dropouts

Thirteen percent of the teachers on non-Title I eligible campuses said that none of their students would drop out before high school graduation, 61 percent said 1 to 10 percent would drop out, 22 percent estimated that 11 to 50 percent would drop out, and 2.3 percent indicated that over 50 percent would drop out.

Four percent of the teachers on Title I eligible campuses said that none of their class would drop out, 35 percent estimated that

1 to 10 percent would drop out, 49 percent reported that 11 to 50 percent would drop out, and 11 percent said that over 50 percent of their pupils would drop out.

Reading Ability

A majority of the second grade teachers, on Title I eligible campuses and on non-Title I eligible campuses, indicated that less than 25 percent of their pupils were one year or more below grade level in reading.

Teachers indicated the percentage of pupils in their classrooms who read one or more years below grade level, based upon the concept of national norms. Fourteen percent of the teachers on non-Title I eligible campuses reported that none of their students were reading a year or more below grade level, 62 percent said up to 25 percent of the class was reading one year or more below grade level, 16 percent indicated that 26 to 75 percent were reading one year or more below grade level, and 4 percent said over 75 percent of their class was reading one year or more below grade level.

Six percent of the teachers on Title I eligible campuses reported that none of their pupils were reading one year or more below grade level, 42 percent estimated that 1 to 25 percent of their pupils were reading one year or more below grade level, 32 percent said that 26 to 75 percent of their pupils were reading one year or more below grade level, and 14 percent reported that over 75 percent of their class was reading one year or more below grade level.

A majority of the second grade teachers, on Title I eligible campuses and on non-Title I eligible campuses, indicated that less than 25 percent of their pupils were one year or more below grade level in reading. The majority of teachers of Grades 4 and 6 on Title I eligible campuses estimated that over 25 percent of their pupils were reading one year or more below grade level. However, less than 25 percent of the teachers on non-Title I eligible campuses estimated that over 25 percent of their pupils were reading one year or more below grade level. One might assume that second grade students have not been in school long enough to be more than a year below grade level in reading, while fourth and sixth grade students could possibly be this far below grade level.

It appears that the pupils who need to be able to avail themselves of Title I services and programs are in the Title I schools, since a greater percent of those students one year or more below grade level are in Title I eligible campuses as opposed to non-Title I campuses.

TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS:

Title I eligible campuses have more male and minority group teachers than do other campuses. Approximately 13 percent of the teachers on Title I eligible campuses were males, while only 6 percent of the teachers on non-Title I eligible campuses were males. A closer examination according to grade level in Table B-3 reveals that most of the male teachers are teaching upper grades.

A very negligible percent of teachers on both types of campuses were members of the American Indian and Oriental racial or

Table B-3

PERCENTAGE OF MALE TEACHERS ON TITLE I ELIGIBLE AND NON-TITLE I ELIGIBLE CAMPUSES

Grade Level	Percentage of Male Teachers From Title I Eligible Campuses	Percentage of Male Teachers From Non-Title I Eligible Campuses
Grade 2	.7%	
Grade 4	10.0	3.0%
Grade 6	31.0	16.0

national origin groups. On non-Title I eligible campuses, five percent of the teachers were Negro and four percent were Spanish-surnamed Americans. Eighty-nine percent said that they were not a member of any of the four racial or national origin groups mentioned. On the Title I eligible campuses 24 percent of the teachers were Negro and 13 percent were Spanish-surnamed American. About 62 percent of the teachers responded that they did not belong to any of the 4 groups mentioned.

Educational and Experiential Background of Teachers

In both types of schools over 50 percent of the teachers have 10 years or more experience in grades Pre-kindergarten through 12. On the non-Title I eligible campuses, 8 percent said they had taught 1 year or less, 9 percent reported more than 1 year but less than 3 years experience, 18 percent indicated experience of at least 3 years but less than 6 years, 14 percent said they had at least 6 years but less than 10 years, 27 percent reported at least 10 years but less than 20 years, and 24 percent reported 20 years or more of experience. The percentages for the breakdowns above were very similar for teachers on Title I eligible campuses. Seven percent recorded 1 year or less, 8 percent said they had more than 1 year but less than 3 years, 15 percent said they had at least 3 years but less than 6 years, 15 percent reported at least 6 years but less than 10 years, 29 percent indicated at least 10 years but less than 20 years, and 26 percent reported 20 years or more of teaching experience.

The number of years in which a teacher had taught in a particular school was approximately the same for both types of schools. On Title I eligible campuses and non-Title I eligible campuses, 33 percent and 39 percent of the teachers from the respective campuses had taught in their particular school less than 3 years. Twenty-nine percent and 22 percent of the teachers from the respective campuses had taught in their particular school 10 years or more.

Less than one percent of the teachers surveyed on Title I eligible and non-Title I eligible campuses were emergency certified. Eighty percent of the teachers from non-Title I eligible campuses had regular certificates and 18 percent had provisional or temporary certificates. Seventy-eight percent of the teachers from Title I eligible campuses had regular certificates and 20 percent had provisional or temporary certificates. This may have been confusing to some teachers since Texas' regular certificate is called a Provisional Certificate.

One percent or less of the teachers on both Title I and non-Title I eligible campuses had no college degree. These may well be the same teachers who responded that they were emergency certified. Sixty-five percent of the teachers from non-Title 1 eligible campuses had Bachelor's degrees and 23 percent had Master's degrees. Seventy percent of the teachers from Title I eligible campuses had Bachelor's degrees and 26 percent had Master's degrees.

Inservice Training Received by Teachers

Teachers from Title I eligible campuses received fewer clock hours of inservice training than did other teachers. The percent of teachers receiving inservice training for a specified number of hours are shown in Table B-4.

Table B-4

HOURS OF INSERVICE TRAINING RECEIVED BY TEACHERS

Number of clock hours of inservice training	Percentage of teachers from Title I eligible campuses who received inservice training	Percentage of teachers from non-Title I eligible campuses who received inservice training
None	10	14
1-10	28	27
11-30	45	38
31-50	8	10
More than 50	9	10

The inservice training covered new instructional techniques in various subject areas. The percentage of teachers who received any training in these areas are shown in Table B-5.

Many teachers on both types of campuses also received other inservice training in new techniques for diagnosis for pupil problems, individualized instruction, and use of equipment and materials. The majority of teachers on non-Title I eligible campuses received training relevant to target groups other than those listed on the questionnaire, indicating they taught a regular classroom with no specific target group such as disadvantaged or handicapped. Some of the teachers from Title I eligible schools responded similarly, but a large percent indicated that their training was relevant to target groups of academically disadvantaged pupils, socio-economically disadvantaged pupils, and pupils from homes where the dominant language was not English. Most of the teachers received training relevant to their school situation.

Personal Feeling About School

Given a choice next year, 82 percent of the teachers from non-Title I eligible campuses and 78 percent of the teachers from Title I eligible campuses responded that they would like a class like the one they had this year. Approximately half of the teachers on both types of campuses indicated that the elementary school in which they were teaching was a personal choice. The other half of the teachers indicated that they had been assigned to their particular school.

Table B-5

PERCENT OF TEACHERS WHO RECEIVED TRAINING IN SUBJECT AREAS

Subject areas in which training was received	Percentage of teachers from Title I eligible campuses who received training	Percentage of teachers from non-Title I eligible cameived training
Mathematics	30	35
Reading	42	53
English Language Arts	63	65
Social Studies	30	27
English As A Second Language	6	9
Occupational Familiarization	16	12
Other Academic Subject	23	23
Cultural Enrichment	27	25

INSTRUCTIONAL ORGANIZATION:

Grouping

Pupils were grouped according to their reading ability or achievement by 86 percent of the teachers on Title I eligible campuses who did not provide instruction in federally funded programs and on non-Title I eligible campuses. Ninety-two percent of the teachers on Title I eligible campuses who provided instruction in federally funded programs said they grouped pupils according to ability or achievement in reading. Approximately half of the teachers from all three categories of teachers grouped pupils according to ability or achievement in mathematics. Less than 25 percent of the three types of teachers grouped according to ability or achievement in English language arts, science, social studies or other academic subjects.

Less than one-third of all teachers surveyed reported that pupils received special academic instruction from another teacher in a subject area which they also taught. This same number said their class was grouped with one or more other classes for instruction in some subjects and pupils of their class participated in a program for individualized or programmed instruction.

Team teaching was used with the whole class by about seven percent of the teachers. Specialist teachers of art, music, reading, etc., were used according to 58 percent of the teachers from non-Title I eligible campuses, 57 percent of the teachers from Title I eligible campuses who provided instruction in federally funded programs, and 48 percent of the teachers from Title I eligible campuses who did not provide instruction in federally funded programs.

In all three teacher categories, the percent of teachers reporting that they did not teach mathematics, reading or English language arts increased from second to fourth to sixth grade.

Length of Instruction

The teachers were asked to indicate the minimum and maximum number of minutes in an instructional period for reading, mathematics and English language arts. The three categories of teachers all reported 41 to 60 minutes as both the minimum and maximum number of minutes in an instructional period at Grades four and six. The minimum number of minutes in a period in second grade was 16 to 40 minutes and the maximum number of minutes was 31 to 50 minutes.

About 90 percent of the three categories of teachers responded that they had four or five instructional periods per week in reading, mathematics and English language arts. Almost 100 percent of the teachers indicated that the instruction in the three subject areas took place over 30 weeks or the entire school year. The data collected from the Pupil Questionnaire helps substantiate the data reported here.

Teaching Techniques and Approaches

The responses to questions about techniques and approaches used in the instruction of mathematics, reading and English language arts were approximately the same for the three categories of teachers. The responses indicated that the techniques used were no different than those used in the past. Newer techniques are seldom used.

Most of the teachers indicated that when giving instruction in mathematics, reading or English language arts they often followed the textbook, or centered activities around "building up generalizations", "building up skills", or a unit or theme. Most of the teachers reported that after a pupil has read some material or has been given some information in mathematics, reading or English language arts he was asked to repeat the content, explain the meaning of the material or information in his own words, use the information in a particular and concrete situation, analyze the information by identifying its elements and their relationships, or draw together various parts of the information to make a reasonable conclusion, and sometimes requested him to make judgments about the value or trustworthiness of the materials or information.

Most of the teachers indicated that they often used the following techniques in mathematics, reading and English language arts:

- asked questions
- answered pupils' questions or elaborated on pupils' comments
- gave directions
- directed recitation and drill activities
- reported results of pupils' work back to them

Most of the teachers also indicated that they sometimes administered diagnostic tests and almost never supervised computer assisted or programmed instruction. About one-third of teachers indicated that they lectured often, one-third sometimes and one-third almost never. Most of the teachers had discussions and supervised individualized activities at least some of the time, and seldom supervised inquiry activities which required experimentation or research.

Use of Aides

Only 10 percent of the teachers from non-Title I eligible campuses had teacher aides, while 41 percent of the teachers from Title I eligible campuses who provided instruction in federally funded programs and 24 percent of the teachers from Title I eligible campuses who did not provide instruction in federally funded programs had aides.

PARTICIPATION OF PUPILS IN FEDERALLY FUNDED PROGRAMS:

Fifty-eight percent of the teachers from non-Title I eligible campuses reported that none of their pupils participated in programs funded by federal sources. Thirty-six percent of the teachers from Title I eligible campuses who did not provide instruction in federally funded programs and 12 percent of the teachers from Title I eligible campuses who provided instruction in federally funded programs indicated that none of the pupils in their homeroom participated in programs funded by federal sources. This does not necessarily mean that the teacher did not provide instruction in a federally funded program since pupils often changed classes for instruction.

Most of the three categories of teachers indicated that pupils in their class participated in the federally funded programs during the regular school day rather than before school, after school, or on weekends. Table B-6 shows the percent of teachers who said pupils participated in federally funded programs in certain subject areas.

Table B-6

PERCENT OF TEACHERS WITH PUPILS IN FEDERALLY FUNDED PROGRAMS

Subject area of federally funded program	Percentage of teachers from Title I eligible campuses who provided instruction in Federally funded program	Percentage of teachers from Title eligible campuses who did not provide instruction in Federally funded program	Percentage of teachers from non-Title I eligible campuses
Mathematics	46%	12%	18%
Reading	74	40	23
English Language Arts	51	12	11
Science	40	7	14
Social Studies	37	7	11
Occupational Familiarization	6	1	3

SPECIFIC TEACHING ASSIGNMENT:

Eighty percent of the teachers from Title I eligible campuses who provided instruction in federally funded programs reported than they taught reading in a program funded by federal and non-federal sources, 62 percent indicated that they taught mathematics in a program funded by federal and non-federal sources, and 70 percent reported that they taught English language arts in a program funded by federal and non-federal sources. A very small percentage of teachers from Title I eligible campuses who provided instruction in federally funded programs reported that they did not teach the subject. About 80 percent of the teachers on Title I eligible campuses who did not provide instruction in federally funded programs said they taught non-federally funded programs in the subject area. The remainder of the teachers indicated they did not teach the subject.

In the area of mathematics, reading, and English language arts about 64 percent of the teachers from non-Title I eligible campuses reported that all of their teaching in the specific subject area was in a non-federally funded program, 20 percent said they taught in programs funded by federal and non-federal sources, less than 15 percent reported that they did not teach the subject, and less than 1 percent of the teachers indicated that all of their teaching in the specific subject area was in a federally funded program.

PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES:

Pupil personnel services were adequate according to the three categories of teachers in the area of attendance, health, and testing, but inadequate in special tutorial services. Social work, psychological services, and guidance and counseling were considered adequate by about one-third of the three types of teachers, inadequage according to about one-third of the teachers, and not available to about one-third of the teachers.

Less than 10 percent of the pupils in a class received pupil personnel services for academic problems according to 57 percent of the teachers from Title I eligible campuses who provided instruction in federally funded programs, 78 percent of the teachers from non-Title I eligible campuses, and 72 percent of the teachers from Title I eligible campuses who did not provide instruction in federally funded programs. This indicated that more students with academic problems are in the classes of teachers who provide instruction in federally funded programs, and hopefully these students received such instruction.

Pupil personnel services for social or emotional problems were provided to less than 10 percent of the pupils in the classes of 87 percent of the teachers from non-Title I eligible campuses, 78 percent of the teachers from Title I eligible campuses who did not provide instruction in federally funded programs, and 72 percent of the teachers from Title I eligible campuses who provided instruction in federally funded programs.

Less than 10 percent of the pupils received pupil personnel services for health problems in the classes of 70 percent of the teachers from non-Title I eligible campuses, 64 percent of the teachers from Title I eligible campuses who did not provide instruction in federally funded programs, and 52 percent of the teachers from Title I eligible campuses who provided instruction in federally funded programs.

AVAILIBILITY AND QUALITY OF MATERIAL AND EQUIPMENT:

Most of the teachers from the three categories often used books and printed materials, other than student textbooks, in their instructional activities. Newspapers, magazines and other periodicals, motion pictures, filmstrips, slides and transparencies, and tape recordings and records were used at least some of the time by most of the teachers. All of these materials were readily available, technically good, and appropriate for pupils' learning levels according to the teachers. The content of these materials was accurate and current. Individual video tapes or television tapes were not available in most cases.

PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE

GENERAL INFORMATION:

The information from the Principal Questionnaire of the 1970 Elementary School Survey was divided into those campuses providing ESEA, Title I funded programs and/or activities and those campuses not providing servicesunder ESEA, Title I (non-Title I eligible campuses).

The Principal Questionnaire was completed by the principal of each campus included in the Survey. Other campus personnel provided information about special services offered on that campus. There was a total of 295 campuses from which data were collected. Of this number, 124 were non-Title I campuses and 171 were campuses which received Title I funds.

INSTRUCTIONAL ORGANIZATION:

There were approximately twice as many pupils participating in federally-funded programs on campuses with Title I funds as were participating on the non-Title I campuses. The federally-funded programs included were ESEA, Title I, III, VII, and VIII, and Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. The percentage of pupils in Grades 2, 4, and 6 of the total campus enrollment was approximately the same (51 percent of Title I eligible campuses and 52 percent of non-Title I eligible campuses) for both types of campuses. Prekindergarten and kindergarten pupils participating in federally funded programs on the Title I eligible campuses were 14 times greater than participants on the non-Title I eligible campuses, pointing out that preschool education was being provided to those pupils most in need of training before the regular school curriculum begins. Four percent of the Title I eligible campuses provided prekindergarten education and 25 percent provided kindergarten education. On the non-Title I eligible campuses, only .8 percent (or one campus) indicated that they provided prekindergarten education and 11 percent provided kindergarten education.

The kinds of campuses included in this survey were: elementary campuses, K through 6; junior high campuses, including Grades 6 through 8; and campuses which constituted a single attendance area of a school district, thus accounting for the data on Grades 9 through 12. To be included in the Survey, however, a campus had to provide instruction to pupils at Grades 2, 4, or 6.

The percent of campuses providing instruction at each of grade levels 1 through 12 is shown in Table C-1:

TABLE C-1

PERCENT OF CAMPUSES PROVIDING INSTRUCTION AT EACH GRADE LEVEL

Grade Level	Title I Eligible Campuses	Non-Title I Eligible Campuses
1	79%	81%
2	81	81
3	80	81
4	84	87
5	82	84
6	70	75
7	15	14
8	12	6
9	3	-
10	2	-
11	2	-
12	2	-

Special classes for handicapped were provided on 28 percent of the Title I eligible campuses surveyed and on 23 percent of the non-Title I eligible campuses surveyed.

Campuses with Title I funded programs are more likely to be organized by grade levels than are other campuses. Seventy-three percent of the Title I eligible campus principals reported all classes (Grades Prekindergarten through 6) were graded; 4 percent reported all classes were ungraded; and 20 percent reported classes were both graded and ungraded. Sixty-seven percent of the non-Title I eligible campus principals reported all classes were graded; 6 percent reported all classes were ungraded; 25 percent reported classes were both graded and ungraded. Two percent of the principals on both types of campuses gave no response.

Principals indicated that on Title I eligible campuses pupils are being homogeneously grouped for instructional purposes more than pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses. For purposes of completing this question, the definition given for heterogeneous grouping was "a grouping of pupils in which no particular attention is paid to assigning pupils according to their similarity in a specific trait" and the definition for homogeneous grouping was "pupils grouped on the basis of a high degree of similarity with respect to any one or more of a number of traits; e.g., pupils may be grouped according to their ability to read although these pupils will naturally vary in other traits."

Pupils were grouped homogeneously on 22 percent of the Title I eligible campuses and on 12 percent of the non-Title I eligible campuses. The pupils were grouped heterogeneously on 36 percent of the Title I eligible campuses and 37 percent of the non-Title I eligible campuses. Both methods of grouping were used on 41 percent of the Title I eligible campuses and on 49 percent of the non-Title I eligible campuses. There was no response for one percent of both types of campuses. This suggests that Title I eligible campus personnel were recognizing the distinct needs of their pupils and planned specific programs to meet their needs.

Teacher recommendations and pupil grades are most frequently used to assign pupils to classrooms. Principals indicated how assignments were made by marking all methods of assignment which were used on their campus, and the degree to which that method was used (i.e., for most pupils, for some pupils, or never use). Regardless of grouping methods, pupils were assigned to classrooms on Title I eligible campuses according to:

(1) Teacher recommendation "for most pupils" on 41 percent of the campuses, "for some pupils" on 41 percent of the campuses, and "never used" on .6 percent of the campuses.

(2) Pupils' grades "for most pupils" on 39 percent of the campuses, "for some pupils" on 21 percent of the campuses, and "never used" on 6 percent of the campuses.

(3) Standardized test scores "for most pupils" on 29 percent of the campuses, "for some pupils" on 22 percent of the campuses, and "never used" on 14 percent of the campuses.

(4) Special needs "for most pupils" on 23 percent of the campuses and "for some pupils" on 50 percent of the campuses.

(5) Parent request "for most pupils" on .6 percent of the campuses, "for some pupils" on 35 percent of the campuses.

Pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses were assigned to classes according to:

(1) Teacher recommendation "for most pupils" on 48 percent of the campuses, "for some pupils" on 39 percent of the campuses.

(2) Pupils' grades "for most pupils" on 40 percent of the campuses, "for some pupils" on 19 percent of the campuses, and "never used" on 8 percent of the campuses.

(3) Standardized test scores "for most pupils" on 36 percent of the campuses, "for some pupils" on 21 percent of the campuses, and "never used" on 17 percent of the campuses.

(4) Special needs "for most pupils" on 19 percent of the campuses, "for some pupils" on 54 percent of the campuses, and "never used" on 2 percent of the campuses.

(5) Parent request "for some pupils" on 36 percent of the campuses and "never used" on 15 percent of the campuses.

Student request, alphabetical listing and "no predetermined basis" were rarely used on campuses of either type. These percentages substantiate previous findings regarding placement of students in classes.

LOCATION OF CAMPUSES:

Principals indicated that five percent of the Title I eligible campuses and two percent of the non-Title I eligible campuses were Model Cities or Model Neighborhood schools. In each group there were two percent who did not respond to this question.

Thirty-one percent of the Title I eligible campuses were in cities of 200,000 and greater population; 26 percent were in small cities or towns with less than 50,000 population; 19 percent were in middle-sized cities of populations from 50,000 to 200,000; 11 percent were in rural areas; 8 percent were in areas near a large city; and 6 percent were in areas near a middle-sized city.

The greatest percent of the non-Title I eligible schools were also located in large cities over 200,000 population (40 percent); 19 percent were in small cities or towns of less than 50,000 population; 27 percent were in middle-sized cities of 50,000 to 200,000; 12 percent were in areas near a large city; and only 2 percent were in areas near a middle-sized city. There were no non-Title I campuses in the survey which were located in a rural area.

PUPIL POPULATION DESCRIPTORS:

The pupils, who are from families receiving welfare, socio-economically disadvantaged pupils, are being served with federal funds which were designed to meet their special needs.

Fifty-six percent of the principals said that from 1 to 10 percent of their pupils were from families who received welfare; 26 percent said 11 to 25 percent of their pupils were from these families; 11 percent said that 26 to 50 percent of their pupils were from these families; and 4 percent of the principals on Title I eligible campuses said that over 50 percent of their pupils were from families whose primary means of support was a public welfare program. Only one percent of the principals on Title I eligible campuses said that none of the pupils on their campuses were from families supported by a welfare program. Two percent of the principals on Title I eligible campuses did not respond to this question.

In contrast to these figures, 39 percent of the principals on non-Title I eligible campuses said that none of their pupils were from families whose primary means of support was a public welfare program. Fifty-nine percent of the principals said that from 11 percent to 75 percent of their pupils were from these families.

There appear to be few economically disadvantaged pupils on campuses which do not receive ESEA, Title I funds, but the disadvantaged pupils on such campuses may be without the benefit of needed special services. Variations in funding patterns may be necessary to provide for those students.

A greater percentage of sixth grade pupils on Title I eligible campuses were reading below grade level than were sixth grade pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses.

Table C-2 provides the principals' estimates of the percent of sixth grade pupils in their schools, by Title I eligible and non-Title I eligible campuses, who were reading one or more years below grade level according to current test data.

TABLE C-2

ESTIMATES BY PRINCIPALS OF PERCENT OF SIXTH GRADE PUPILS READING BELOW GRADE LEVEL

Percent of Sixth Grade Pupils Reading Below Grade Level	Percent of Principals Estimating Sixth Grade Pupils Reading Below Grade Level	
	Non-Title I Eligible Campuses	Title I Eligible Campuses
None	4%	3%
1 - 10%	33	10
11 - 25%	28	22
26 - 50%	14	27
51 - 75%	5	12
76 - 90%	.8	4
91 -100%	-	1

No response was recorded for 21 percent of the principals from Title I eligible campuses and 15 percent from non-Title I eligible campuses.

The analysis of standardized test data and data collected on the Teacher Questionnaire provides a similar picture of the performance of sixth grade pupils. Data on the Teacher Questionnaire were requested for pupils at the sixth grade level and based upon their concept of national norms; 14 percent of the teachers on non-Title I eligible campuses; 5 percent of the teachers of Title I eligible non-participants; and 7 percent of the teachers of Title I funded program participants said they had no pupils below grade level. These data are perhaps more accurate because teachers are able to make a closer analysis of their pupils than are principals. Refer to the analysis of the Teacher Questionnaire for complete data.

FREE OR REDUCED PRICE FOOD:

Eighty-eight percent of the Title I eligible campuses provided free or reduced-price food (i.e., at a price less than the established school price), and 71 percent of the non-Title I eligible campuses provided free or reduced price food.

Table C-3 includes the percent of Title I eligible and non-Title I eligible campuses who provided free or reduced-price breakfasts, lunches, snacks, and milk, and the percent of pupils to whom it was provided.

This free or reduced-price food was probably provided through one or several of these funding sources: National Lunch Program, Free Milk Program, ESEA, Title I, local district funds, and agents outside the local district. Only a small percent of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses received breakfasts or snacks because almost all of the campuses provided this food to only one to ten percent of their pupils. This table is evidence of the fact that socio-economically disadvantaged pupils were receiving more free or reduced-price food than were other pupils.

PUPIL RECORDS:

Information received on the Pupil Questionnaire substantiated the fact that little data is recorded in the school about family income or occupations of parents.

Seventy-eight percent of the principals on Title I campuses and 85 percent of the principals on non-Title I eligible campuses said they did not include data on family income as a part of a pupil's cumulative record. Fourteen percent of the

TABLE C-3

PERCENT OF CAMPUSES PROVIDING FREE OR REDUCED PRICE BREAKFASTS, LUNCHES, MILK, AND SNACKS

% of Pupils Receiving Free or Reduced-Price Food	BREAKFAST		LUNCH		MILK		SNACK	
	Non-T-I El. Campuses	T-I El. Campuses	Non-T-I El. Campuses	T-I El. Campuses	Non-T-I El. Campuses	T-I F1. Campuses	Non-T-I El. Campuses	T-I El. Campuses
1 - 10%	7%	8%	59%	37%	12%	11%	6%	9%
11 - 25%	1%	4%	7%	23%	3%	12%	-	4%
26 - 50%	-	3%	2%	13%	-	14%	-	1%
51 - 75%	-	2%	-	9%	-	6%	-	1%
76 - 90%	-	.6%	-	2%	1%	2%	-	1%
91 -100%	-	2%	3%	4%	6%	3%	-	2%
Total % of Campuses Providing Food	8%	20%	71%	88%	22%	48%	6%	18%

principals on Title I eligible campuses and seven percent of the principals on non-Title I eligible campuses said the data was recorded annually. The other principals indicated either that information was available but not updated, or that it was recorded but less often than every two years (indicated by very few principals).

Data concerning occupations of parents were recorded on pupils' records annually by approximately half of the principals on Title I eligible campuses and 65 percent on non-Title I eligible campuses. Only ten percent of the Title I eligible principals and five percent of the non-Title I eligible principals said that these data were not included on pupils' records. Sixteen percent and ten percent of the principals, respectively, said that these data were available for use on pupils' records, but it was not updated. However, there were 13 percent and 18 percent, respectively, who recorded these data semiannually or more often.

Achievement test data were updated on pupils' cumulative records annually by principals of over 50 percent of the campuses, both Title I and non-Title I. More non-Title I eligible campuses, 75 percent, recorded these data annually. Only one campus, a Title I eligible campus, did not include this information on pupils' records at all. Fifteen percent of the Title I eligible campuses recorded achievement test data semiannually, which probably indicated that scores are recorded at both the pre- and post-testing dates.

Class grades are recorded either semiannually or annually on both non-Title I eligible and Title I eligible campuses.

PROGRAM ORGANIZATION INFORMATION:

All pupils participated in federally funded academic programs on most Title I eligible campuses. Forty-seven percent of the principals of Title I eligible campuses and 23 percent of the eligible campuses indicated that if their campuses had any program or project funded in whole or in part by ESEA, I, III, VII, VIII, or the Vocational Education Amendment of 1968 which related to academic instruction in a subject matter area, all of the pupils in all regular classrooms in all grades were provided with this instruction.

Twenty-five percent of the Title I campuses and three percent of the non-Title I eligible campuses had no programs funded by federal sources which were provided to all pupils in all classes. There was a relatively high rate of "no responses" on this question, nine percent and ten percent, respectively.

Of those campuses which said they did not provide federally-funded academic instructional programs to all pupils, 86 percent of the principals on Title I eligible campuses and 75 percent on non-Title I eligible campuses indicated that the programs which were provided required special assignment of teaching personnel.

On Title I eligible campuses, district level assignment was the most frequent basis (42 percent) for selection of personnel to teach these instructional programs. However, 34 percent of the Title I eligible campuses had personnel teaching in these areas because they were specially trained. Another 14 percent were teaching in those positions because they had previous teaching experience. Only three Title I eligible campuses had no specific basis for selecting personnel for these special teaching assignments.

On non-Title I elgibile campuses, almost all of the personnel assigned to teach academic programs that were provided to only some of the pupils on the campus were given the assignment because they had received specialized training.

Fifty-six percent of the non-Title I eligible campuses did not have any academic programs provided through federal funds. Nine percent of the Title I campuses and eight percent of the non-Title I eligible campuses had no academic program provided by federal funds. This was not to say that those campuses did not have federally-supported, non-academic type programs in operation.

SCHOOL FACILITIES INFORMATION:

The ratio of small rooms to campuses was greater on the Title I eligible campuses indicating perhaps a greater opportunity for small group instruction. The ratio of classrooms to campuses was about the same on the two types of campuses for the two larger classrooms.

On the Title I campuses, there were 148 rooms for large group instruction (50 or more pupils); 3,440 classrooms for 25-40 pupils; and 161 small rooms for instruction of 10-15 pupils. On the non-Title I eligible campuses, there were 119 rooms for large group instruction; 2,907 classrooms for 25-40 pupils; and 80 small rooms.

The percentages of campuses which indicated having separate specialized facilities are shown in Table C-4. According to this table, the facilities available on Title I eligible campuses and non-Title I eligible campuses were about the same.

PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES:

Pupil personnel services were provided by 37 percent of the Title I eligible campuses and by 25 percent of the non-Title I eligible campuses. These figures included services provided on that campus only, and did not include services provided by the school district or by personnel assigned to more than one campus. Two percent of the principals in each campus group did not respond.

Principals were asked to indicate the persons responsible for performing certain specified pupil personnel services carried out regularly in their school. Over 75 percent of the campuses in both categories reported that teachers, principals and personnel, other than the counselor, psychologist, or social worker, performed the following services:

- Counseling with individual parents regarding problems of their children
- Using pupil records and test data for better understanding of pupils
- Counseling with individual pupils with problems
- Interpreting pupil needs as a basis for curriculum development

TABLE C-4

PERCENT OF CAMPUSES HAVING SPECIALIZED FACILITIES

Type of Specialized Facility	Non-Title I Eligible Campuses	Title I Eligible Campuses
1) Multipurpose large rooms used for multiple activities such as the gymnasium or auditorium	76%	80%
2) Central library room	89%	81%
3) Classroom libraries	52%	63%
4) Learning laboratories (room containing 10 or more carrels or desks where a single student uses instructional materials presented by mechanical or electronic device) .	8%	15%
5) Audio-visual room	46%	41%
6) Teacher reference center	52%	51%
7) Instructional materials production center containing equipment used for production of audio-visual materials	50%	47%
8) Medical examination or treatment facilities staffed with full-time or part-time professional personnel	69%	71%
9) Offices for use by counselors, school psychologists, and parents and pupils.	35%	39%
10) Testing rooms for individual or small groups.	28%	30%
11) Rooms for arts and crafts	35%	25%
12) Special rooms such as shops or labs containing equipment and materials useful for teaching about career opportunities	3%	3%
13) Television production studios	1%	4%
14) Closed circuit television	6%	6%

- Working with parents of pupils with social or emotional problems
- Making referrals to appropriate specialists for pupils

Teachers on Title I eligible campuses conducted more group sessions with pupils to improve motivation than did teachers on non-Title I eligible campuses. Data on the Pupil Questionnaire point out why the pupils on Title I eligible campuses have a need for more counseling in this area.

Approximately 30 percent to 40 percent of the non-Title I eligible campuses employed counselors to perform the following pupil personnel services:

- Counseling with individual parents regarding problems of their children
- Helping teachers use pupil records and test data to better understand pupils
- Counseling with individual pupils
- Working with parents of pupils with social or emotional problems
- Conducting case studies or case conferences for pupils with special learning or adjustment problems
- Making referrals to appropriate specialists for pupils
- Diagnosing learning difficulties of pupils referred by teachers

On Title I eligible campuses, approximately 40 percent to 50 percent employed counselors to perform these duties:

- Counseling with individual parents regarding problems of their children
- Helping teachers use pupil records and test data to better understand pupils

- Counseling with individual pupils with problems
- Working with parents of pupils with social or emotional problems
- Conducting case studies or case conferences for pupils with special learning or adjustment problems
- Making referrals to appropriate specialists for pupils
- Diagnosing learning difficulties of pupils referred by teachers

Psychologists appeared to be used more frequently and performed more services on non-Title I eligible campuses than on Title I eligible campuses. On Title I eligible campuses, psychologists were used primarily for diagnosing learning difficulties of pupils referred by teachers. Psychologists on non-Title I eligible campuses often worked with parents of pupils who had social or emotional problems and conducted case studies or case conferences for pupils with special learning or adjustment problems.

Twenty-one percent of the Title I campuses employed social workers to counsel with individual parents regarding problems of their children, and 15 percent of the non-Title I eligible campuses employed social workers for this purpose.

Counselors, psychologists, and social workers were employed by some districts in order to perform other specific services but these were not significantly large.

Seventeen percent of the principals on Title I eligible campuses indicated that there were no personnel available to conduct group counseling for pupils with special problems; 12 percent said there were no personnel available to conduct group sessions with pupils to improve motivation; 13 percent said there were no personnel to conduct case studies or case conferences for pupils with special learning or adjustment problems; and 9 percent said there were no personnel who could diagnose learning difficulties of pupils referred by teachers.

On non-Title I eligible campuses, 28 percent of the principals said they had no personnel to conduct group counseling for pupils with special problems; 24 percent said there were no personnel available to conduct group sessions with pupils to improve motivation; 19 percent said there were no personnel available to conduct case studies or case conferences for pupils with special learning or adjustment problems; and 11 percent said there were no personnel to diagnose learning difficulties of pupils referred by teachers. Additional data on pupil personnel services provided at the district level were furnished from the District Questionnaire and appear later in this report.

ADEQUACY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES AND RESOURCES:

More than one-third of all principals surveyed said the school plant was fair to poor and that the number of personnel was inadequate. Approximately 42 percent of the principals in both categories felt the number of professional personnel was inadequate. Seventy-two percent of the principals on Title I eligible campuses indicated the number of teacher aides was very inadequate and 80 percent of the principals on non-Title I eligible campuses said the number of teacher aides was very inadequate.

The majority of principals in both categories felt that the size of the physical plant for their pupil population, the number of instructional personnel employed, the quantity of books, periodicals, and other printed materials, the quantity of audio-visual materials, and the quantity of instructional and audio-visual equipment was "adequate" to "very adequate."

Over 70 percent of the principals in both categories indicated that the condition of their physical plant, the suitability (quality) of books, periodicals, other printed materials, audio-visual materials and instructional equipment ranged from good to excellent. Even though these principals had previously indicated that the size of their physical plant was sufficient, 33 percent of the principals on non-Title I eligible campuses and 41 percent of the principals on Title I eligible campuses said the suitability of the physical plant for their program operations was only fair or poor.

OCCUPATIONAL FAMILIARIZATION PROGRAMS:

Four percent of the principals on non-Title I eligible campuses responding to this survey indicated their campus had an occupational familiarization program and eight percent on Title I eligible campuses indicated there was such a program on their campus. The reader will note that later in this report, 58 percent of the superintendents indicated on the District Questionnaire that their district provided an occupational familiarization program. The discrepancy in these two questionnaires cannot be wholly explained. However, it should be noted that not all campuses in the districts surveyed were included in the principal survey. The campuses were chosen on a sample basis and thus these particular campuses might not have provided an occupational familiarization program, and others in the district might have provided these programs. Also, a principal and superintendent might perceive the definition of an occupational familiarization program differently. They were both provided the same definition, however, for purposes of completing their respective questionnaires.

On Title I eligible campuses, the occupational familiarization programs were operated in Grades Kindergarten through 6 and on non-Title I, eligible campuses were operated in Grades 1 through 6.

MEDIA SERVICES, EQUIPMENT, AND MATERIALS:

Principals indicated that media services were provided by 54 percent of the Title I eligible campuses and by 56 percent of the non-Title I eligible campuses. Three and four percent of the Title I and non-Title I eligible campuses, respectively, did not respond. Although media services were provided to a smaller percent of Title I eligible campuses, these campuses had a greater variety of materials and equipment.

The librarian or audio-visual specialist provided information about the equipment and materials available for use on their campuses. Eighty-four percent of the personnel on the Title I eligible campuses indicated their school had a centralized library or media center, and 90 percent of these personnel on non-Title I eligible campuses indicated their school had a centralized library or media center. Three percent and two percent of the personnel, respectively, did not respond to this question.

Most special media personnel on Title I eligible campuses indicated that their campus media center housed some motion pictures, individual filmstrips, slide and transparency sets, tape recordings and records, and individual video tapes. However, approximately 65 percent of these media centers included no motion pictures or individual video tapes.

Audio-visual equipment was maintained in almost all campus media centers on Title I eligible campuses. Only two percent of these centers had no movie projectors; six percent had no filmstrip projectors; one percent had no slides or overhead projectors; six-tenths percent had no tape recorders or record players; and forty percent had no television sets (receivers) for instructional broadcasts.

On non-Title I eligible campuses, most special media personnel indicated that there was a variety of materials available. However, 81 percent of these personnel indicated they had no motion pictures in their campus media center; 10 percent said they had no individual filmstrips; 4 percent said they had no tape recordings or records; 11 percent said they had no slides or transparency sets; and 76 percent said they had no individual video tapes.

There were no non-Title I eligible campuses which did not have special audio-visual equipment available in their campus media centers, except 36 percent who indicated they had no television sets (receivers) for instructional broadcasts.

DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRE

The School District Questionnaire was completed by 74 districts in Texas, which comprise 45.55 percent of the total Average Daily Attendance (ADA) of the state. The implications made from these data and the changes effected by them could ultimately affect approximately one-half of the pupils in the state.

USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS

There were 1,335 campuses located in the 74 school districts. The percent of campuses participating in programs funded by federal sources are as follows:

ESEA, Title I	47.1%
ESEA, Title II	64.8%
ESEA, Title III	37.7%
ESEA, Title VII	4.8%
ESEA, Title VIII	.03%
NDEA, Title III	41.0%
NDEA, Title V-A	15.2%
Vocational Education Amendments of 1968	8.5%
CRA, Title IV	17.2%
Other Federal Sources	4.1%

It should be noted that all districts in the Survey received some Title I funds. However, as the information above indicates, it was not used on all campuses. An error in reporting was noted for the district which reported receiving ESEA,Title VIII funds. There is no ESEA,Title VIII money available to Texas schools included in this Survey.

Only 6.8 percent of the districts completing this Questionnaire indicated that any part of their school district was in an area served by a model cities/model neighborhood program. Of those districts reporting this information, there were 48 campuses which were in these specific areas. This is 3.6 percent of all campuses in the Survey.

INCOME LEVEL OF FAMILIES:

District personnel recorded what they believed to be their best estimate of the median gross income of families in their school districts. There was only one district which indicated that the median gross family income was less than $2,000. This was 1.4 percent of those responding. There were 21.6 percent who believed the median gross family income to be $w,000 to $3,999; 36.5 percent who believed it to be $4,000 to $5,999; 18.9 percent, $6,000 to $7,999; 13.4 percent, $8,000 to $9,999. Two districts believed that the median gross family income was $10,000 or greater. This was 2.8 percent of the districts which responded. There was no response from 5.4 percent of the districts. The estimates were based on 1960 United States Census data, local and state census data since 1960, and "other" information. Sixty-two percent of the districts indicated they used "other" information.

EXTENT TO WHICH SPECIAL NEEDS OF TARGET POPULATIONS WERE MET:

One question on the Survey was concerned with the extent to which special needs of target populations were being met, either by federally or non-federally funded programs. These target groups were the academically disadvantaged, the socio-economically disadvantaged, the academically gifted, pupils from homes where the dominant language was not English, potential dropouts, emotionally or mentally handicapped, migrants, neglected or delinquent pupils, and physically handicapped pupils.

Three percent of the districts responding indicated that there were academically disadvantaged and socio-economically disadvantaged pupils who were in need of programs, but these programs were not available. All districts indicated they were receiving ESEA, Title I funds and these funds were specifically aimed at pupils in these target groups; however, districts might be indicating that they were not receiving enough funds to meet the needs of all of these pupils in their districts. One district indicated that it did not have any pupils who were academically disadvantaged and one district indicated it had a program for this target population but it was not federally funded Ninety-four percent of the districts which responded about the academically disadvantaged indicated that they had programs or projects funded by federal sources available for pupils. Of this 94 percent, 20 percent of the districts served all pupils who had special need; 59 percent of the districts said they served most pupils having special needs; and 15 percent indicated they served only a few pupils in their districts having special needs with federally funded programs. Ninety-five percent of the districts responding about socio-economically disadvantaged pupils indicated that they operated programs or projects funded by federal sources. Of those districts providing federally funded programs for socio-economically disadvantaged pupils, 20 percent of the districts provided programs to all pupils with need, 64 percent provided programs to most pupils with need, and 11 percent provided programs to only a few pupils with need. These data point out that there were some districts which were not being provided with federal funds sufficient to reach even most of the academically and socio-economically disadvantaged pupils in their districts with need for special programs.

According to the questionnaires, 42 percent of the districts reported that there were academically gifted pupils needing special programs, but no programs were available. Another 42 percent reported that they were operating non-federally funded programs. Federally funded programs were provided in 9 percent of the districts, while 8 percent of the districts said their pupils did not need special programs or that they had no pupils who were academically gifted. Those districts which responded that they had federally funded programs for academically gifted pupils did not necessarily mean that these programs were supported by federal funds, but that there were pupils in this target group who were receiving the benefits of some federally funded programs, e.g., ESEA, Title II and Title III.

Some type of federally funded program was provided for pupils from homes where the dominant language was not English in 68 percent of the districts which responded on this particular target group population. However, 26 percent of these districts provided programs to only a few pupils with need of special treatment. Programs were available but not federally funded in 11 percent of the districts;

10 percent of the districts indicated that they did not have pupils needing treatment in this target group; and another 11 percent indicated that they had pupils with need in this target group but there was not a program available for them.

Twenty-three percent of the school districts responding indicated that they had pupils who could be classified as potential dropouts and needed special programs, but no programs were available. Two percent of the districts indicated that they had no potential dropouts or they had no pupils needing these programs. Thirty-nine percent indicated they had programs available but they were not federally funded and 67 percent indicated they had federally funded programs in operation for potential dropouts. Eight percent of these districts provided these programs to all pupils classified as potential dropouts. Thirty-four percent of the districts provided programs to most pupils classified in this manner, and 25 percent of the districts provided the programs to only a few of the potential dropouts who needed special programs.

Fifty-two percent of the districts responding said they did not have any migrant pupils in their districts. Seven percent felt they had migrant pupils who needed a special program but there was no program available. Of those districts responding to this portion of the Questionnaire, there were 37 percent which indicated they operated some type of federally funded program for migrant pupils, and another 5 percent indicated they had a program available to migrant pupils but it was not federally funded.

Neglected or delinquent pupils comprise another target group needing special treatment. However, 39 percent of the districts which responded said they had no neglected or delinquent pupils attending school in their districts. Fourteen percent of the districts said they did have neglected or delinquent pupils needing special treatment, but there were no programs available. Forty-one percent of the districts operated federally funded programs for all the pupils with need, most pupils with need, or few pupils with need, and six percent operated non-federally funded programs.

Information reported by districts on emotionally or mentally handicapped pupils indicated that there were 12 percent of the districts which had these kinds of pupils in their enrollment, but they had no special programs for them. Thirty-nine percent indicated that they did have special programs for emotionally or mentally handicapped pupils, but they were not federally funded. Forty-five percent of the districts said they did operate federally funded programs for this target population group, and 33 percent of the districts said they had federally funded programs for physically handicapped pupils also. Questions might arise as to the source of these federal funds for special education programs. Districts probably responded in this manner if there was any federal money being directed to pupils enrolled in special education and did not necessarily mean that those programs were supported by federal money because they were designed for pupils needing special education.

Nineteen percent of the districts indicated they needed special programs for physically handicapped pupils but such programs were not available. Thirteen percent of the districts said they had no physically handicapped pupils.

The percent of "no responses" by districts on information about programs for each of the target groups ranged from 19 percent on information about migrant pupils to 5 percent on information about socioeconomically disadvantaged pupils and physically handicapped pupils. These percentages are quoted in order to give the reader an idea of how the districts completed the questionnaire.

USE OF STANDARDIZED TESTS:

According to the data from the School District Questionnaire, 99 percent of the districts responding said they had a standardized testing program for most or all pupils in Grades K-6 and there was only one district which did not respond to this particular question. These districts, however, did not administer standardized tests at each grade level. By grade level, the percent of districts which provided this information and said "no standardized test administered" were: Kindergarten, 60 percent, Grade 1, 22 percent; Grade 2, 16 percent; Grade 3, 9 percent; Grade 4, 9 percent; Grade 5, 7 percent; and Grade 6, 10 percent. These data indicate that the greatest amount of standardized testing occurs after Grade 2.

COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEES:

Data about the use of community advisory committees in school districts were requested. Sixty-four percent of the districts in this Survey said they did utilize these committees in many facets of their educational processes. This compares very favorably to the figures available from this Survey on a nationwide basis where 63 percent of the districts reported use of community advisory committees. Some of the major activities performed by advisory committees for federally funded programs include the identification of unmet educational needs and program evaluation for ESEA, Title I, Vocational Education Amendment of 1968,and other federal acts. Advisory committees, where utilized, were also active in the planning of programs supported by these federal funding sources.

REGIONAL SERVICES:

The next section of the Questionnaire is concerned with regional centers from which school district personnel or pupils received services. Two districts in the Survey said they did not receive regional services; therefore, the percentages will be based on only 72 districts.

Regional centers or media centers were funded in whole or in part by ESEA, Title III in 65 percent of the 72 districts. Other federal funds were used in whole or in part in 47 percent of the districts, and 15 percent of the districts reported receiving services from centers funded entirely by non-federal funds.

Approximately 14 percent of the districts claimed responsibility for the administration of the regional center. Since about 15 percent of the districts reported non-federal support of the centers, this leads to the assumption that some of the districts included centers other than the Regional Education Service Centers, such as a center provided by either the district, county, or other organization. More than one regional center was reported available by 24 percent of the districts, which also supports the previous statement.

Most of the districts report use of the centers by administrators and teachers, and some use by nonprofessionals, other professionals, and pupils.

In about half of the districts, one or more of the following services were provided by the regional center: programs or laboratories for work in academic subject areas; reference, resource library services; and pupil personnel services.

About 54 percent of the districts reported that the services provided by the regional center were designed to meet the needs of a particular target group. Of those districts, 85 percent reported emotionally or mentally handicapped as the target group for whom services were aimed; 67 percent reported the academically disadvantaged as the primary target group; 56 percent reported the physically handicapped; and 54 percent reported the socio-economically disadvantaged as the primary target group for which regional services were aimed. It should be noted that more than one target group could have been marked on this question. This is an indication that most school districts had more than one target population for whom they were trying to provide treatment.

DISTRICT SERVICES:

This Questionnaire addressed the services provided by the district to district level personnel, campus personnel, and pupils. Ninety-five percent of the districts indicated that they provided some in-service training to their personnel; 89 percent indicated that there was some evaluation of programs or projects; 91 percent indicated they provided pupil personnel services; 60 percent indicated they had occupational familiarization programs for pupils; and 84 percent indicated they provided media services for school personnel and pupils. Twelve percent of the districts in the Survey did not indicate whether they did or did not have occupational familiarization programs and 11 percent of the districts did not indicate whether they did or did not provide media services for their personnel and pupils.

Districts were then asked if they employed any professional personnel to perform the above-mentioned tasks or provide these services. Their response was not to include any personnel who worked or were assigned to one particular campus. Sixty-six percent of the districts employed personnel to administer pupil personnel services, 62 percent employed personnel for the evaluation of programs or projects, 51 percent of the districts employed personnel to give in-service training to district employees, 38 percent employed personnel for the purpose of presenting occupational familiarization programs, and 57 percent employed personnel to provide media services. The "no response" on this report ranged as high as 18 percent on information requested about personnel employed for the purpose of presenting occupational familiarization programs and 16 percent on information requested about media personnel.

Some misunderstanding might occur in reference to the percent of districts providing occupational familiarization programs and the percent of districts hiring personnel to administer these programs. The definition given to the districts for purposes of completing this Questionnaire stated that an occupational familiarization program was "any type of planned learning activity which has the primary goal of familiarizing pupils with career opportunities and/or experience to facilitate career choice in later years, regardless of source of funds". Following this definition, districts perhaps responded to these questions about occupational familiarization programs with their guidance and counseling staff as the personnel providing this type activity or program. It is known that two districts included in this Survey had specific funding for occupational familiarization programs which leads to the consensus that a broad interpretation was made of this definition.

This Survey of Texas districts ranked favorably with the figures which were received from the survey on the national level. The only area in which it appeared that the nation as a whole was doing better than texas was in employing personnel to provide pupil personnel services. However, it should be emphasized that these figures represent personnel who were available at the district level to serve all schools in that district. Most districts in Texas have personnel on each individual campus providing some pupil personnel services. See the data from the Principal Questionnaire.

INSERVICE TRAINING:

Questions relating to in-service training provided by the district for four categories of personnel were asked, according to the sources of funds supporting these activities. Approximately ten percent of the districts in this Survey did not provide any in-service training to their personnel during the 1969-70 school year. The greatest number of personnel were provided in-service experiences which would train or introduce new instructional techniques particularly relevant to instructing academically disadvantaged pupils, socio-economically disadvantaged pupils, and pupils from homes where English was not the dominant language. This type of training was provided to teachers, other professionals, teacher aides, and other non-professionals. In all cases, this training was provided for through both federal and non-federal funds, with an approximately equal number receiving training through federal and non-federal sources of funds.

Training in specific subject matter areas was provided for teachers in approximately 67 percent of the instances through non-federal funds; for other professional personnel, 77 percent of the training was provided through non-federal funds; and for teacher aides approximately 53 percent of the training was provided through non-federal funds. Teachers received the most training in the area of reading, with English language arts and mathematics receiving a greater amount of attention in training sessions than other subject matter areas. Other professionals as well as teacher aides also received a concentration of training in reading.

Training was provided to more teachers for the purpose of instructing them in the use of equipment and materials than was provided for the introduction to new techniques in the diagnosis of academic or emotional problems of pupils or in introducing new techniques for individualized instruction. Teacher aides' training was concentrated in instructing them in the use of equipment and materials. It is difficult to apply percentages to this portion of the Questionnaire because school districts could mark all responses that applied to their districts.

SERVICES PROVIDED TO STUDENTS:

Information was requested about services which were provided to students. These services were guidance and counseling, testing, psychological services, attendance and social work, and health services. Districts were to mark all responses that applied to the type of services which they provided. Sixty-five percent of the districts indicated that guidance and counseling services were routinely given to all pupils, 39 percent of the districts provided this service at the request of campus or district-level personnel, and 31 percent said they would provide the service at the request of parents and/or pupils. Only 5 percent of the districts said they provided no guidance and counseling services to pupils.

Eighty percent of the districts said that they routinely tested all pupils, 31 percent said they tested at the request of campus or district-level personnel, and 22 percent tested at the request of parents and/or pupils. Only 3 percent, or two districts, said they had no testing program. This corresponds closely to information previously recorded on this Questionnaire about testing. One district had said it did not give pupils standardized tests, and another district did not respond to the question. Another aspect of this question regarding testing as a service is that districts probably interpreted this to include all tests given, such as psychological tests, IQ tests, and others.

Psychological services were provided to the greatest percent of pupils either upon request of the campus or district-level personnel, or of parents and/or pupils, this being true for 57 percent and 35 percent of the districts, respectively. Only one district routinely provided this service and 23 percent of the districts did not provide any psychological services.

Attendance services and social workers were provided at the request of campus or district-level personnel in 43 percent of the districts. Thirty-eight percent of the districts indicated they routinely gave this service and 22 percent provided the service only upon request of the parents and/or pupils. Fourteen percent did not provide this service.

Health services were routinely provided by 77 percent of the districts in the Survey, 28 percent provided the service at the request of campus or district-level personnel, 23 percent provided the service upon request of parents and/or pupils. Seven percent of the districts did not provide any health services.

OCCUPATIONAL FAMILIARIZATION PROGRAMS:

Emphasis is currently being placed on familiarizing pupils with information that would place them in better positions to make career choices in their future years. As previously stated in this report, the definition given for use in completing the District Questionnaire was "any type of planned learning activity which has the primary goal of familiarizing pupils with career opportunities and/or experiences to facilitate career choice in later years, regardless of source of funds". In the 1969-70 school year, there were 30 districts in this Survey which conducted occupational familiarization programs. Two of these districts conducted occupational familiarization programs as separate subjects or programs in their curriculum.

Thirty-two percent or 23 or the districts indicated that they had programs which were incorporated as an integral part of the regular subjects, e.g., English, science, etc., and seven percent or five of the districts said they had a program which was a combination of the two previously-mentioned types of operations. Of those occupational familiarization programs which were operated as a part of other curriculum courses, it is not known how much time was spent and to what extent attention was devoted to familiarizing pupils with occupational choices. Those districts which said they used a combination of the two methods of presenting career choices probably meant that there were certain class periods which were devoted entirely to occupational familiarization. Approximately 15 percent of the campuses in this Survey did offer some type of occupational familiarization program.

Fifty-eight percent of the districts said they offered no program in occupational familiarization and two districts did not respond to this question.

Districts were asked to indicate what types of personnel participated in in-service training activities in order to prepare them for teaching an occupational familiarization program to elementary students. Approximately 47 percent of the districts indicated that they provided no training for their personnel. Of those districts which provided in-service training, the greatest number (33 percent, or 10 districts) provided the training to grade or general subject teachers and to campus-located guidance personnel. Vocational or occupational subject teachers were provided training in 27 percent of the districts with occupational familiarization programs, and school district specialist personnel were provided training in 17 percent of those districts.

The grade or general subject teachers were actively involved with pupils in these programs in 93 percent of the districts which operated occupational familiarization programs and in 37 percent of these districts the campus-located guidance personnel were in direct pupil contact situations. Twenty-seven percent of these districts indicated they utilized personnel from business and industry and other school personnel in direct involvement with pupils.

Those districts operating occupational familiarization programs indicated the elementary grade levels at which these programs were operated. Participation of pupils in Grade 1 was indicated by 57 percent of the districts; Grade 2 pupils, by 63 percent; Grade 3 pupils, by 70 percent; Grade 4 pupils, by 73 percent; Grade 5 pupils, by 87 percent; and Grade 6 pupils, by 90 percent. It is readily apparent from these data that most occupational familiarization programs are provided for pupils in Grades 5 and 6.

Eighty percent or 24 or these districts required participation of all pupils at the grade level where the program was provided. Seventeen percent or 5 of these districts said that participation was on a selective basis. Four of these districts said they specifically selected socio-economically disadvantaged pupils; and two selected handicapped pupils for participation in occupational familiarization programs.

Districts were asked to record what policy governs the type of career information to which participating pupils are exposed. Thirty-seven percent of the districts said that pupils were exposed to a standard foundation of career information or experience; 23 percent of the districts exposed pupils to a standard foundation of career information or experience with provisions for supplementing individual interests; 17 percent said that pupils were exposed to career information on a self-selection or personal interest basis only; 13 percent said exposure to career information was on the basis of school personnel assessment of career potential; and 7 percent said that information was provided on the basis of a rationale other than those already mentioned.

The districts completing this Questionnaire were asked if they were planning to institute an occupational familiarization program within the next three years if they did not now have a program. Since there were 30 districts in the Survey which indicated they presently operated a program, only 44 districts should have responded to this question. However, 46 districts responded. Therefore, the following percentages are only approximations. Thirty percent said they were planning a program within three years, 23 percent said they were not, and 52 percent said they did not know if their district would have an occupational familiarization program in three years.

DISTRICT MEDIA SERVICES:

The supervisors of the district media services were asked to indicate which kinds of media centers were available for use by personnel or pupils in the district. Twenty percent of the supervisors indicated that a state media center was available and 26 percent said a state center was not available. Fifty-one percent of the supervisors indicated that a regional media center was available and 4 percent said it was not. Fifty-five percent of the district media supervisors said there was a district media center available for use. There were 42 percent, or 31 districts in the Survey which indicated that they had no district media centers.

Supervisors indicated that in 93 percent of those districts which have a district media center, teachers and other professional personnel utilized the center, in 67 percent of the districts teacher aides and other non-professional personnel utilized the center, in 77 percent of the districts media personnel used the center, in 42 percent of the districts pupils used the center, and in 35 percent "others" used the center.

Seventy percent of the districts with media centers kept only a few of their books and printed materials (excluding texts) in those centers. However, there were several districts which did keep all of their books and printed materials in the centers.

Approximately half of the districts with media centers kept some of their audio-visual materials in those centers and the remainder of the districts kept almost all of their audio-visual materials in the centers.

It appeared that the majority of the districts did not keep their audio-visual equipment in the centers, but instead kept the equipment in other locations. There were a very few districts which indicated they housed all of the audio-visual equipment in the media centers.

Approximately half of the districts have up to 500 individual filmstrips, slide sets, transparencies, tape recordings and records in their media centers. However, 16 percent of the districts did not have any of these kinds of materials. A third of these districts did not have any motion pictures. There were two districts which indicated they had large numbers, up to 6,000, of these kinds of materials in their media centers.

DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED BY DISTRICTS:

The last item on the District Questionnaire pertained to actions taken by school districts or actions which affected pupils in the district. Three districts in this Survey indicated that court orders concerning civil rights had caused serious difficulties in their districts during the 1969-70 school year. However, there were no serious difficulties in the districts surveyed due to voluntary or involuntary decisions about bussing pupils or to large pupil turnovers.

APPENDIX A

STANDARDIZED TEST DATA

The pupils from whom usable test data were available were divided into three categories: (1) pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses; (2) pupils on Title I eligible campuses and participating in Title I funded academic programs; and (3) pupils on Title I eligible campuses who were not participating in Title I funded academic programs but who may have been receiving Title I funded services. These are the same categories of pupils used in the examination of the Pupil Questionnaire. These categories were used in order to compare the test scores of students receiving more intensive treatment and those not receiving this treatment. Another aspect of examining these three groups of pupils was to determine if the pupils who were in need of special treatment were receiving that treatment.

Standardized Test Results Presented as Gains Per Assumed Month of Instruction

In order to examine these test results on a consistent basis, the interval between testing periods was recorded for each pupil, as well as the difference between the pre- and post-test scores. The months between testing periods were converted to reflect the assumed number of months of instruction that the pupil had received. The gain for each month the pupil received instruction was then computed by dividing the converted number of months between testing periods into the gain or loss reflected for that pupil. A gain or loss per each month of instruction was then obtained. A 1.0 indicated that a pupil had achieved all that was expected of him for each month of instruction.

For example, a pupil had gained four months from the time he was pre-tested to the time he was post-tested. The interval between these testing periods was 12 months. Assuming the pupil received 10 full months of instruction, he should have made a normal gain of one month for each month he was instructed, or 1.0 months gain. However, he only achieved .4 of what was expected of him for each month he was instructed.

Tables 1 and 2 indicated the number of pupils who were tested in each subject matter area, for each of the three categories of pupils, for each combination of pre- and post-tests that were admin- at each of the three grade levels. The mean gain per assumed month of instruction was then determined for these categories of pupils. A median, as well as the range of gains, is also indicated in order to give the reader some idea of where the pupils' gain scores per month were located on a scale. The median indicates that half the pupils fell below that point and half were above. The range shows the lowest gain score below the median and highest gain score above the median.

More data than could be presented here were examined before making any of the following statements. These data were not included in this report because of the large number of tables that were used in the compilation of all the data. The complete analysis is available for any further study desired.

Upon close examination of the available data it was impossible to say that pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses were achieving more than either the pupils who were being instructed in Title I funded academic programs or those who may have been receiving Title I services, or vice versa. All those pupils in Grade 2 tested with California Lower Primary at both testing periods appeared to be achieving at approximately the same level. (See Table 1) However, those in Title I funded academic programs, in English language arts, had a mean gain per assumed month of instruction that was much lower than either the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses or the pupils on Title I eligible campuses who may have been receiving Title I funded services but not special treatment in English language arts.

Those pupils in Grade 2 who were participating in Title I funded English language arts programs and were pre-tested with the Stanford Primary I and post-tested with the Stanford Primary II, at first glance, had a much higher mean gain per month of instruction than the pupils in the other two categories. (See Table 2) However, it should be noted that in English language arts this was only the mean for two pupils. Still another examination of the data indicated that those pupils on Title I eligible campuses who were not in academic programs had a higher level of achievement than either of the other two categories of pupils. However, this analysis had limited utility because of the problems of group size and various standardized tests.

An analysis of Grade 4 and Grade 6 pupils indicated that all pupils, regardless of the type program they were involved in, achieved at approximately the same rate. The differences were not significant. This might lead to the conclusion that pupils who were receiving special treatment in subject matter areas were not achieving at any faster rate than those who were not receiving special treatment. There are many factors, however, which should be considered before making these kinds of conclusions. Some of these factors include:

- The achievement tests may not measure what is being taught.
- The students receiving special treatment in a subject area might not progress as fast as they do in a regular program.
- The students receiving special treatment in a subject area may be far below grade level; therefore, any gain is significant.
- The rate at which students in regular programs are progressing may be slower than it should be according to test norms.

The data presented in the analysis did not reflect to what extent the pupil was above or below grade level. It only serves to show how much he gained. It did not show the point from which he started, the pre-test grade equivalence, or the point which he had reached at the time of post-testing.

A Comparison of Test Results of Students Having Persistent Problems and Those Not Having Persistent Problems

The second analysis was made by examining the extent to which pupils were above or below grade level in the three subject areas on pre- and post-tests. Within each subject area, a mean number of years above or below grade level was computed according to whether the pupil's teacher indicated a persistent problem in the particular subject matter. The number of months above or below grade level for a pupil, at the time of pre-testing, was computed by subtracting the grade level at which the pupil should have been on the date of pre-testing from the grade equivalence reported on the standardized pre-test. For example, a second grade student in 1970, assumed to be in the second grade for the first time, pre-tested in April, 1969, should have a grade level equivalence of 1.8. His standardized test score, however, was 2.3. Therefore, he was assumed to be five months above grade level at the pre-testing date. This was recorded as .5 in terms of a 10-month year, as shown by the key at the bottom of Tables 3 and 4. Another second grade student, also pre-tested in April, 1969, had a standardized test score of 1.2. Therefore, he was assumed to be six months below grade level or .6 in terms of a 10-month year.

The number of months above or below grade level at post-test date was computed in an identical manner.

In addition to recording the number of months in years for each pupil in the three subject areas and pupil categories, notation was made of the teachers's judgment regarding the student's having persistent problems in a particular subject area. This judgment was made by the teacher at the end of the school year.

TABLE 1 Grade 2 Pupils with Standardized Test Results

Pre-tested with California Lower Primary Post-tested with California Lower Primary

	Pupils on Non-Title I Campuses			Pupils on Title I Campuses Participating in Title I Academic Programs			Pupils on Title I Campuses Who May be Receiving Title I Services		
	Reading	Math	English Language Arts	Reading	Math	English Language Arts	Reading	Math	English Language Arts
N	43	45	43	14	2	6	54	55	32
Mean Gain per Assumed Month of Instruction	.9	.8	.8	.8	.85	.15	.6	.7	.6
Median of the Gains per Assumed Month of Instruction	.9	.8	.8	.9	.85	.25	.5	.5	.6
Range of Gains for Assumed Month of Instruction	-.3 to 2.0	-.3 to 1.7	-.5 to 2.0	-.1 to 1.7	.7 to 1.0	-.3 to .4	-.7 to 1.8	-.3 to 2.8	-.5 to 2.3

TABLE 2 Grade 2 Pupils with Standardized Test Results

Pre-tested with Stanford Primary I Post-tested with Stanford Primary II

	Pupils on Non-Title I Campuses			Pupils on Title I Campuses Participating in Title I Academic Programs			Pupils on Title I Campuses Who May be Receiving Title I Services		
	Reading	Math	English Language Arts	Reading	Math	English Language Arts	Reading	Math	English Language Arts
N	35	35	14	17	6	2	57	66	23
Mean Gain per Assumed Month of Instruction	1.1	.4	.5	.9	.8	1.2	1.0	.8	.8
Median of the Gains per Assumed Month of Instruction	.9	.4	.3	.8	.85	1.2	.9	.7	1.0
Range of Gains for Assumed Month of Instruction	-.2 to 3.1	-1.9 to 2.6	-1.0 to 2.5	0 to 2.2	-.2 to 1.8	.6 to 1.8	-.8 to 4.3	-.4 to 4.6	-1.0 to 4.4

The pre-test scores of all students of one pupil category and one test combination, with persistent problems in reading, were added together and the mean number of years above or below grade level was computed. The mean number of years above or below grade level was similarly computed in math and in language arts for students with persistent problems in the respective subject matter areas. The mean number of years above or below grade level was also computed for those students for whom the teacher did not indicate any persistent problems in each subject area for each pupil category.

For students with or without persistent problems, an identical process was used to determine the mean number of years above or below grade level the students were on the post-tests.

These findings are recorded on Tables 3 and 4. Included on these tables is the number of students examined. The reader should note the key at the bottom of the page, which explains the ten-month year figures.

An examination was made of the mean number of years above or below grade level of students in Grades 2, 4, and 6 for whom teachers indicated no persistent problems. An examination was also made of the mean number of years above or below grade level of students indicated by the teacher to have persistent problems in a particular subject area. In comparing the two means, the mean for students without persistent problems was in almost all cases further above grade level or less below grade level than the mean for students rated with persistent problems.

This finding indicates that according to standardized test results, the teachers' indications of students' persistent problems seem to be justified. However, it should be pointed out that those students for whom no persistent problems were indicated were not necessarily above grade level and those with persistent problems were not consistently below grade level. This finding causes one to suspect that criteria other than standardized test results were used in judging whether or not a student had persistent problems in a certain subject area. (Teachers do not necessarily perceive persistent problems in students where test data indicate problems. Standardized tests may not be measuring what the teacher perceives as the pupil's need for instruction.) Some other criteria used to judge persistent problems might be teacher-made tests of the curriculum taught, observation, class participation, or a demonstration of knowledge of the particular area in daily work.

The mean number of years above or below grade level for pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses with or without persistent problems do not necessarily occur further above grade level or less below grade level than those of pupils on Title I eligible campuses who may have been receiving services. In some cases just the opposite occured, in other cases the means were approximately the same.

It can be seen in Table 3 that the respective mean number of years above or below grade level for students in non-Title I funded programs was higher than those means for pupils participating in Title I funded academic programs, but not necessarily higher or lower than the respective means of pupils on Title I eligible campuses who hay have been receiving services.

In a majority of cases the mean number of years above or below grade level of pupils on Title I eligible campuses participating in

Mean Number of Years* (Based on a 10-month School Year)
Above or Below Grade Level for Pupils
Having Persistent Problems and Those not Having
TABLE 3 Persistent Problems as Indicated by Teachers at End of School Year

Grade 2 Pre-tested with California Lower Primary Post-tested with California Lower Primary

Subject Area	Pupils on Non-Title I Campuses			Pupils on Title I Campuses Participating in Title I Academic Programs			Pupils on Title I Campuses Who May Be Receiving Title I Services		
	N	Pre-Test	Post-Test	N	Pre-Test	Post-Test	N	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Reading:									
Persistent Problems	4	-.4	-.9	7	-.5	-.7	24	-.6	-.7
No Persistent Problems	40	.6	.5	5	-.2	-.5	30	.1	-.2
Math:									
Persistent Problems	4	-.1	-.6	2	-.7	-.9	15	-.6	-.9
No Persistent Problems	40	.4	.3	--	--	--	40	-.1	-.4
English Language Arts:									
Persistent Problems	5	-.2	-.5	3	.1	-.7	11	-.7	-1.0
No Persistent Problems	39	.7	.5	3	.1	-.6	21	.1	.1

*Key: .1 = 1 month
.5 = 5 months
1.0 = 1 year
1.5 = 1 year, 5 months

TABLE 4 Mean Number of Years* (Based on a 10-month School Year) Above or Below Grade Level for Pupils Having Persistent Problems and Those not Having Persistent Problems as Indicated by Teachers at End of School Year

Grade 4 Pre-tested with Iowa Test of Basic Skills Post-tested with Iowa Test of Basic Skills

Subject Area	Pupils on Non-Title I Campuses			Pupils on Title I Campuses Participating in Title I Academic Programs			Pupils on Title I Campuses Who May Be Receiving Title I Services		
	N	Pre-Test	Post-Test	N	Pre-Test	Post-Test	N	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Reading:									
Persistent Problems	14	-.7	-1.1	19	-1.1	-1.2	46	-1.1	-1.2
No Persistent Problems	32	.8	.7	13	- .8	- .7	75	- .3	- .6
Math:									
Persistent Problems	12	-.5	-.6	14	-1.0	- .2	40	- .7	- .9
No Persistent Problems	35	.5	.1	17	-1.1	- .6	87	.9	.1
English Language Arts:									
Persistent Problems	9	-.5	-.7	13	- .8	-1.4	39	- .3	-.9
No Persistent Problems	37	.9	.3	15	- .1	- .3	89	.2	.01

*Key:
.1 = 1 month
.5 = 5 months
1.0 = 1 year
1.5 = 1 year, 5 months

Title I funded academic programs indicates that the students were below grade level. In addition to this fact, the mean of those students often falls below the respective means of the pupils on non-Title I eligible campuses and the pupils on Title I eligible campuses who may have been receiving Title I funded services. These facts give some indication that students needing the academic programs were being served. However, the low means of students on Title I eligible campuses who may have been receiving Title I funded services who had persistent problems indicated a need for more students to be included in the Title I funded academic programs.

It should be remembered by the reader that these findings are based on test data from a very small number of pupils.

Percent of Pupils Above or Below Grade Level

A second analysis was made of the number of years above or below grade level computed for pupils in the three subject areas. These figures were again gathered for pre- and post-tests according to test combination, pupil category, and subject matter area.

Eight classifications of the number of years above or below grade level of students were devised. These classifications are:

a. Two years or more below grade level
   (-2.0 or below)
b. One year through one year, nine months below grade level
   (-1.0 through -1.9)
c. Five months through nine months below grade level
   (-.5 through -.9)
d. One month through four months below grade level
   (-.1 through -.4)
e. On grade level through four months above grade level
   (1 through .4)
f. Five months through nine months above grade level
   (.5 through .9)

g. One year through one year, nine months above grade level
   (1.0 through 1.9)
h. Two years or more above grade level
   (2.0 or above)

The number of students with a score falling in a certain classification were counted. The percent of students in each classification on pre- and post-tests was then computed based on the total number of students in the respective subject area and pupil category.

There was a general trend for students to drop further behind grade level as they moved from pre- to post-test. This trend is exemplified in Table 5, Reading for Non-Title I Campus Pupils. On the pre-test, 2.3 percent of the students fell in the classification -.5 through -.9. On the post-test, the percentage in that classification (-.5 through -.9) had increased to 9.1 percent. In addition to this increase, 2.3 percent of the students fell in a classification representing a greater number of months below grade level (-1.0 through -1.9).

This trend was present in Grades 2, 4, and 6, and in all test combinations and pupil categories. This seems to indicate that the achievement tests are not testing what is being taught. The hierarchy of the curricula being taught by the teachers may not coincide with the hierarchy of questions asked by the achievement test producers. Perhaps our own curricula are not being tested. This leads to several questions:

- Are we testing what is being taught?
- Should we be testing what is taught?
- Should we teach what is being tested?
- Are the test manufacturers better informed as to what a child should know by a certain grade level?

According to the information on Table 6, there appeared to be a greater percentage of non-Title I eligible students on or above grade level than in either of the two Title I eligible pupil categories.

TABLE 5

Percent of Grade 2 Pupils Above or Below Grade Level in Reading, Math, and English Language Arts

Pre-tested with California Lower Primary

Post-tested with California Lower Primary

Number of years* (based on a 10-month school year) above or below grade level	Reading						Math						English Language Arts					
	Non-Title-I Campus Pupils		Title-I Program Participants		Title-I Campus Pupils		Non-Title-I Campus Pupils		Title-I Program Participants		Title-I Campus Pupils		Non-Title-I Campus Pupils		Title-I Program Participants		Title-I Campus Pupils	
	N=44		N=12		N=54		N=44		N=2		N=55		N=44		N=6		N= 32	
	% Pre-Test	% Post Test	% Pre-Test	% Post-Test	% Pre-Test	% Post-Test	% Pre-Test	% Post-Test	% Pre-Test	% Post-Test	% Pre-Test	% Post-Test	% Pre-Test	% Post-Test	% Pre-Test	% Post-Test	% Pre-Test	% Post-Test
-2.0 or below																		
-1.0 through -1.9		2.3		33.3	13.0	37.0		2.3		50.0	7.2	21.8		4.5		33.3	9.4	28.1
- .5 through - .9	2.3	9.1	33.3	33.3	29.6	24.1	2.3	11.4	100	50.0	25.5	27.3	4.5	9.1		16.7	28.1	18.7
- .1 through - .4	22.7	20.5	58.3	8.3	27.8	11.1	13.6	20.5			30.9	18.2	11.4	15.9	33.3	33.3	25.0	18.7
0 through .4	34.1	13.6	8.3	16.7	13.0	14.8	45.4	22.7			23.6	20.0	29.5	20.5	50.0	16.7	12.5	15.6
.5 through .9	15.9	22.7		8.3	9.2	7.4	27.3	31.8			9.1	7.2	22.7	18.2	16.7		12.5	12.5
1.0 through 1.9	22.7	31.8			5.5	3.7	9.1	11.4			1.8	5.5	29.5	31.8			9.4	6.3
2.0 or above	2.3				1.9	1.9	2.3				1.8		2.3				3.1	

*Key:
.1 = 1 month
.5 = 5 months
1.0 = 1 year
1.5 = 1 year, 5 months

TABLE 6

Percent of Students On or Above Grade Level or Below Grade Level According to Pupil Category

	Non-Title I Campus Pupils			Title I Program Participants			Title I Campus Pupils		
	N	% on or above grade level	% below grade level	N	% on or above grade level	% below grade level	N	% on or above grade level	% below grade level
Reading: Grade 2	85	72	28	63	21	79	130	32	68
Grade 4	128	46	54	78	15	85	189	32	68
Grade 6	136	65	35	81	9	91	156	31	69
Math: Grade 2	85	85	15	8	0	100	167	43	57
Grade 4	128	60	40	46	24	76	212	39	61
Grade 6	140	55	45	48	25	75	169	38	62
English Language Arts: Grade 2	57	84	16	8	50	50	68	46	54
Grade 4	116	65	35	43	28	72	199	47	53
Grade 6	134	64	36	47	26	74	156	44	56

There also seem to be a greater percentage of pupils on Title I eligible campuses who were on or above grade level than participants in Title I funded programs. This helps somewhat to substantiate the previous statement that the right pupils were being served. At the same time it brings a question to mind: Why were students who were above grade level on pre- and post-tests placed in Title I funded programs? There exist several possible explanations for this question:

- Students may be selected according to income rather than ability.
- Students may be selected to participate in Title I funded programs according to teacher recommendations and teacher grades, as the total state figure on the Survey indicates.
- Perhaps students were arbitrarily selected.

This might substantiate a previous suggestion, that other criteria including teacher judgment were used more than standardized test data to place students in Title I funded programs.

Educational Attainment Expected of Pupils by Teachers

In addition to recording test data information and teachers' indications of pupils' persistent problems, the teacher recorded an opinion of how far a pupil could go in school considering the pupil's scholastic potential. There were five possible ratings. These are:

1 -- eighth grade or less
2 -- ninth grade or further, but not high school graduation
3 -- graduate from high school
4 -- post high school education except college
5 -- enter college

The percent of non-Title I eligible students rated 1 or 2 by the teachers was in all cases less than the percent of pupils on Title I eligible campuses so rated. Both of these percentages are less than the percent of Title I funded program participants rated 1 or 2. The figures appear below.

	Percentage of Non-Title I Campus Pupils Rated 1 or 2	Percentage of Title I Program Participants Rated 1 or 2	Percentage of Title I Campus Pupils Rated 1 or 2
Grade 2	5	26	23
Grade 4	13	38	18
Grade 6	11	33	20

This indicated that the teachers of students in Title I funded programs expected a lower educational attainment for these students. By contrast, teachers of pupils on non-Title I campuses expected students to achieve a greater level of success in education.

The percent of all of the students rated 1 or 2, for whom test data were examined in this paper, is 19 percent. The percent of the total number of students rated 1 or 2 for whom data were gathered on the Elementary School Survey was 16 percent. Although the sample of students' data discussed in this paper is somewhat biased due to testing information available, as previously mentioned, the percent of pupils for which there was test data is relatively close to that of the total state sample.

Summary of Implications Made by This Analysis

Throughout this study various indications have continually been present. Some of these indications discussed include:

- Texas does not have a uniform standardized testing program.
- A broad range of tests were used which cannot be examined statewide.

- Achievement tests may not test the material taught in the schools.
- More students need learning assistance in academic programs.
- Some students in Title I funded academic programs may not need this type of assistance.
- Teachers use methods other than standardized testing to judge students.
- Students in the three categories discussed exhibit similar performance between pre- and post-testing.
- Teachers' expectations of educational attainment levels of pupils coincide with the types of programs in which students are enrolled.

Some implications for further study include:

- A close examination of the Title I funded programs and selection of participants
- A modification of the testing procedures in Texas
- An in-depth study of the relationship of teachers attitudes to pupil achievement.